DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 981 UD 035 006

AUTHOR Thomas, Regina; Woods, Paul; Hillman, Stephen; Ross, Steven M.

TITLE The Detroit Public Schools Michigan Department of Education CSRD Grant Funded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Models, 1998-1999 through 2000-2001. A Joint Collaborative Preliminary Evaluation.

INSTITUTION Memphis Univ., TN. Center for Research in Educational Policy.; Wayne State Univ., Detroit, MI. Coll. of Education.; Detroit Public Schools, MI. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

PUB DATE 2002-03-00

NOTE 96p.

PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Educational Change; Educational Environment; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Grade 4; Grade 7; Grants; Scores; Teacher Attitudes; Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program; Detroit Public Schools MI; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the Michigan Department of Education Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Grant Funded Reform Demonstration Program, which helps raise student achievement in the Detroit Public Schools. The four objectives evaluated were: CSRD schools will demonstrate differences in the classroom learning environment compared to non-CSRD schools; CSRD schools will have a better school climate; teachers from CSRD schools will have positive opinions about the effectiveness of the CSRD model; and CSRD schools will show more growth in student achievement than traditional schools. The evaluation included 20 CSRD schools and their matched controls. Evaluation involved the School Observation Measure, School Climate Inventory, Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire, provider survey, and student outcome data. CSRD schools used mainly direct instruction. Student behavior, trust, and parent/community involvement were concerns in most schools. Key elements for success included support from the faculty, staff, and administration. CSRD providers offered such support services as onsite and offsite visits, monitoring, professional development, and training workshops. While fourth grade control students' reading scores increased, CSRD students' scores decreased. In mathematics, fourth graders had similar decreases. The two groups had similar seventh grade reading score decreases and mathematics score increases. Appendices include tables and the provider survey. (Contains 16 tables.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 464 981

The Detroit Public Schools Michigan Department of Education CSRD Grant Funded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Models

1998-1999 through 2000-2001

A Joint Collaborative Preliminary Evaluation

by

Detroit Public Schools
Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Department of Curriculum Development and Related Programs
Division of Learning and Educational Accountability
Regina Thomas, Ph.D., Evaluator

Wayne State University
Paul Woods, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education
Stephen Hillman, Ph.D., Professor, College of Education

and

The University of Memphis-Center for Research in Educational Policy
Steven M. Ross, Ph.D.

March, 2002

UD 035 006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Moore
Detroit Public Schools, Evaluation & Testing Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Program Facts	i
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study/Methodology	4
Findings/Conclusions	7
Recommendations	67
Appendixes 1 - 5	68

PROGRAM FACTS

Name of Program:	Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Models
Funding Year:	1999-2000 2000-2001
Purpose of Program:	The aim of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) state funded grant program, which began in 1998, is to raise student achievement. CSRD attempts to raise student achievement by helping public schools across the country implement successful comprehensive school reform models.
Features of Program:	This evaluation is a joint effort of the Detroit Public Schools, Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Wayne State University, College of Education, and the University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. It focuses only on schools with state grant funded CSRD programs. There are nine CSRD programs involved in this evaluation. They are: ATLAS Community, Co-nect, Core Knowledge, Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK), Lightspan, Microsociety, Middle Start, School Development, and Talent Development.
Funding Services:	Funds are allocated under Section 1502 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
Funding Level:	Elementary, Middle and High Schools Total Grant funds requested for the school year 1999-2000 - $3,565,443.00 Total Grant funds requested for the school year 2000-2001 – $3,699,748.00

Number, Level, Names of Schools in Program, and Models Used:

4 High Schools	Model Used
• Cody	ATLAS Community
• Denby	Talent Development
• Murray-Wright	ATLAS Community
• Southeastern	ATLAS Community
6 Middle Schools	
• Beaubien	School Development
• Coffey	ATLAS Community
• Lessenger	ATLAS Community
• McMichael	School Development
• Munger	Middle Start
• Winterhalter	Co-nect
10 Elementary Schools	
• Clark	DwoK*
• Cooke	School Development
• Cooper	School Development
• Detroit Open	Middle Start
• Grayling	School Development
• Hampton Elementary	DwoK*
• Hosmer	Microsociety
• Mason	Core Knowledge
• Parker	Lightspan
• Phoenix Academy	Talent Development

Staffing Pattern: Total School Involvement

Instructional Time: Entire School Year – On-going Process

Equipment/Materials: Equipment and materials vary by model.

First Year Funded: 1998-1999 Application submitted - Funding granted
1999-2000 (year 1 CSRD implementation)
2000-2001 (year 2 CSRD implementation)

Additional Information: Contact Regina Thomas, Ph.D., Detroit Public Schools, Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment at (313) 494-2022.

*DwoK –Different Ways of Knowing

THE DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
CSRD GRANT FUNDED
COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM DEMONSTRATION (CSRD) MODELS
PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Regina Thomas, Ph.D., Evaluator

1998-1999 through 2000-2001

Executive Summary

Purpose and Features of the Program

The aim of the Michigan Department of Education Grant Funded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program, which began in 1998, is to raise student achievement. CSRD attempts to raise student achievement by helping public schools across the country implement successful comprehensive school reform models.

There are nine CSRD programs involved in this study. They are: ATLAS Community, Co-nect, Core Knowledge, Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK), Lightspan, Microsociety, Middle Start, School Development, and Talent Development.

This study was developed to look at each CSRD model and answer the following four questions:

1. What are the similarities and/or differences in outcomes for schools involved in each of the nine CSRD models?
2. What is working and should be continued?
3. What is not working and should be discontinued?
4. What should be modified?

Methodology

This evaluation is a joint effort of the Detroit Public Schools, Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Wayne State University, College of Education, and the University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. It focuses only on schools with state grant funded CSRD programs.

This evaluation assesses four programmatic objectives. ***Objective 1***-Schools with CSRD models will demonstrate a difference in the classroom-learning environment when compared to schools without CSRD models. ***Objective 2*** – Schools with CSRD models will have a better school climate than schools without CSRD models. ***Objective 3*** – Teachers from schools with CSRD models will have positive opinions on the effectiveness of the CSRD model associated with their school. ***Objective 4*** – Schools with CSRD models will show a higher academic growth in student achievement than schools without CSRD models. A total of 20 CSRD grant funded schools and their matched control schools are part of the evaluation.

This evaluation consist of six parts:

1. School Observation Measure (SOMe)
2. A School Climate Inventory (SCIe)
3. The Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQe)
4. Survey of Providers
5. Student Outcome Data – Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Grades 4 and 7 – Mathematics and Reading total school scores
6. Student Outcome Data – Metropolitan Achievement Test-7th Edition (MAT7) Grades 1-10 total school scores and individual student scores for students who were in the same school from 1998-1999 through 2000-2001 and those who were in the same school for fewer years.

Findings

Data results of the ***School Observation Measure, a School Climate Inventory,*** and ***the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire*** were prepared by Dr. Steven Ross, from the University of Memphis-Center for Research in Educational Policy. The results are presented in **Part 1** of the report in its entirety. A few key findings follow.

- Research schools had significantly higher levels of occurrence than the control schools in the areas of integration of subjects, project based learning, higher-level questioning strategies, and the use of computers for instructional delivery.
- Direct instruction was a predominate instructional orientation in all of the schools.
- Cooperative and collaborative learning was not observed in nearly one-half (44.4%) of the elementary schools and approximately one-half (50.7%) of the middle/high schools.
- It appears that student behavior is an issue of concern in the elementary schools as well as the middle-high schools.
- Also consistent across elementary and middle-high schools is the area of trust, as an area of potential concern.
- Parental and community involvement also appears to be an area of concern for the elementary as well as the middle-high schools. However, there appears to be a more active effort in the elementary schools to involve the parents.
- It should also be kept in mind that the increasing of the parental and/or community involvement levels does take time and requires communication and awareness.
- Collaboration items appear to be in acceptable ranges for early implementation. There are some areas (i.e., commitment and communication) that are higher in elementary schools, while the middle-high schools have a higher level of participation in decision-making.

- It appears that a key element to the success of a model in a school is the level of support it receives and maintains from the faculty, staff, and administration.
- It appears that a key element to a successful implementation and progression of a program is having a benchmark document to detail the plan and to evaluate the progress.

The district level findings related to the ***Survey of Providers*** and Achievement Test Results from the ***Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)*** and the ***Metropolitan Achievement Test-7th Edition (MAT7)*** are presented as **Part 2** of the report.

A total of nine CSRD providers were surveyed by telephone during the month of October 2001. Some key findings follow.

- The majority of providers reached contractual agreement with schools in 1998-1999 (67%).
- CSRD providers reported giving support service to the schools that included on-site visits (95%), monitoring (90%), off-site visits (85%), professional development (85%), and teacher training workshops (80%).
- The hours of training provided varied depending on the model. The response level from providers ranged from "15 hours to 1,000 hours".
- Many providers (67%) felt that the level of teacher readiness for the model process was moderate.

The MEAP total group results for three years (1998-1999 through 2000-2001) show:

- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, there was a 23.1 increase in the percent of Grade 4 students attaining satisfactory reading scores at the 10 control schools while there was a 5.9 decrease in the percent of students attaining satisfactory reading scores at the 14 experimental (CSRD) schools.
- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, the change in the percent of Grade 4 students attaining satisfactory mathematics scores was essentially the same for the 10 control schools (0.9% increase) and the 14 experimental schools (0.1% decrease).
- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, the results for Grade 7 reading were identical for both the control and experimental schools. There was an 11.1 decrease in the percent of Grade 7 students attaining satisfactory reading scores at both the 7 control and 8 experimental schools.
- The Grade 7 mathematics test was discontinued by the state in 2000-2001. Data from 1998-1999 to 1999-2000 show a 0.1 increase in the percent of Grade 7 students attaining satisfactory scores in the 7 control schools and a 6.1 increase in the percent of students attaining satisfactory scores in the 8 experimental (CSRD) schools.

The MAT7 total group scores for three years (1998-1999 through 2000-2001) show:

- In reading, both control and experimental schools experienced declines in the percents of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between the base year (1998-1999) and 2000-2001. The decline in control schools was 3.6 percent (from 27.2% to 23.6%). For the experimental schools, the decline was 7.0 percent (from 27.8% to 20.8%). For the district as a whole, there was a decrease of 3 percent in the percent of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between 1998-1999 and 2000-2001.
- In mathematics, both control and experimental schools experienced small gains in the percents of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between the base year (1998-1999) and 2000-2001. The gain in control schools was 1.9 percent (from 25.3% to 27.2%) while in the experimental schools, the gain was 0.5 percent (from 21.6% to 22.1%). For the district as a whole, there was a decrease of 1 percent in the percent of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between 1998-1999 and 2000-2001.

The MAT7 individual student scores of control and experimental schools for three consecutive years (1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001) were compared with scores for students who attended a control or experimental school for less than three years, in both reading and mathematics. Also, the MAT7 scores were analyzed by CSRD grant funded models.

Trends

In addition to reviewing gains, it is important to look at end point scores as schools could show greater gains simply because they began from a much lower point. In this regard, when reviewing the percents of students at or above the 50th percentile in year 3, Tables 13 and 14 show that in reading for 2000-01, students who were in the same CSRD school for at least 3 years outperformed students who had been in a control school for at least 3 years when the school had the following CSRD project.

- ATLAS Community
- Co-nect
- Lightspan
- Microsociety
- Middle Start

Such was not the case in schools with Different Ways of Knowing, School Development and Talent Development.

When reviewing the percents of students at or above the 50th percentile in year 3, Tables 15 and 16 show that in mathematics for 2000-01, students who had been in a control school for at least 3 years outperformed students who were in the same CSRD school for at least 3 years when the school had the following CSRD project.

- ATLAS Community
- Co-nect
- Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)
- Lightspan
- Microsociety
- School Development
- Talent Development

There was only one CSRD model, Middle Start, where such was not the case. A caution is issued here in that these reading and mathematic results are based on one year's data at a limited number of schools.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the district and schools review the findings presented in this report and use them to inform decision-making regarding project continuation.

2. In this preliminary report, it is important to emphasize that the MEAP data analysis targeted whole-school percentage counts at the satisfactory level only. The MAT7 data analysis reviewed whole-school percentage counts of students who scored at or above the 50th percentile. In the next evaluation, it is recommended that statistical analysis be conducted of students scoring in the lower ranges.

3. Obtain staff stability records, if available, from the Detroit Public School System Human Resource Department to evaluate the staff stability at both the control and experimental schools over the years of the project. This is important for the assessment of the effects of staff stability on school success.

The Detroit Public Schools
Michigan Department of Education CSRD Grant Funded
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Models
1998-1999 through 2000-2001
Preliminary Evaluation

Introduction
by
Regina Thomas, Ph.D., Evaluator
Detroit Public Schools
Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment

Introduction

The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program attempts to raise student achievement by helping public schools across the country implement successful, comprehensive school reform models. In 1998-1999, the Detroit Public Schools applied to the Michigan Department of Education for grant funding to implement CSRD models. The grant was the result of a 1997 act by the U.S. Congress.

This evaluation is a joint effort of the Detroit Public Schools, Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Wayne State University, College of Education, and the University of Memphis – Center for Research in Educational Policy. The evaluation focuses on the effects of school reform on student achievement and other school outcomes. A total of 20 Detroit Public Schools, (four high schools, six middle schools, and ten elementary schools), received CSRD funding from the Michigan Department of Education for the school year 1999-2000 to implement a model of their choice. The models chosen were:

1. ATLAS Community
2. Co-nect
3. Core Knowledge
4. Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)
5. Lightspan
6. Microsociety
7. Middle Start
8. School Development
9. Talent Development

In the school year 2000-2001, all schools funded in 1999-2000 had to reapply for CSRD funding. Two of the twenty schools (Cooke and Cooper) elected not to continue with their CSRD model. However, Cooper chose another model and funding choice (Modern Red Schoolhouse funded by Schools of the 21st Century).

For this evaluation, a total of 40 schools (20 experimental schools and 20 control schools) were involved in the initial CSRD evaluation in the school year 1999-2000. **See Table 1.** The control schools were chosen based on the following criteria:

- Geographic location
- School Size
- Poverty Rate
- 1998-1999 MAT7 scores

Table 1
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Grant Funded Schools
1999-2000

Experimental Schools & Model Used		*Control Schools*
4 High Schools		**4 High Schools**
Cody	ATLAS Community	Chadsey
Denby	Talent Development	Finney
Murray-Wright	ATLAS Community	Kettering
Southeastern	ATLAS Community	Northwestern
6 Middle Schools		**6 Middle Schools**
Beaubien	School Development	Boynton
Coffey	ATLAS Community	Durfee
Lessenger	ATLAS Community	Hampton Middle
McMichael	School Development	Post
Munger	Middle Start	Ruddiman
Winterhalter	Co-nect	Sampson
10 Elementary Schools		**10 Elementary Schools**
Clark	DwoK	Bagley
Cooke*	School Development	Greenfield Union
Cooper*	School Development	Hanstein
Detroit Open	Middle Start	Krolik
Grayling	School Development	Logan
Hampton Elementary	DwoK	Ludington
Hosmer	Microsociety	Lynch
Mason	Core Knowledge	Monnier
Parker	Lightspan	Van Zile
Phoenix	Talent Development	Yost
Total = 20		**Total = 20**

*Cooke did not continue the model in 2000 - 2001.
*Cooper switched models in 2000 - 2001 becoming a Skillman funded Red Schoolhouse project.

In 2000-2001, the number of experimental schools increased from 20 to 24. Two schools Cooke and Cooper were dropped from the original list as of 2000-2001, because both schools elected not to reapply for the Michigan Department of Education CSRD funding for the school year 2000-2001. **See Table 2.**

Table 2

Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Schools
with
CSRD Grant Funding for
2000-2001
School List

School Name	*CSRD Model*
1. Detroit Open School*	Middle Start
2. Munger Middle School*	Middle Start
3. Winterhalter Elementary*	Co-nect
4. Yost**	Co-nect
5. Lodge**	Co-nect
6. Detroit Clark Elementary*	Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)
7. Detroit Hampton Elementary*	Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)
8. Beaubien Middle School*	School Development
9. Grayling Elementary*	School Development
10.McMichael Middle School*	School Development
11. Carstens**	School Development
12. Western High School**	School Development
13. Cody High School*	ATLAS Community
14. Coffey Middle School*	ATLAS Community
15. Lessenger Middle School*	ATLAS Community
16. Murray-Wright High School*	ATLAS Community/Schools 21st Century
17. Southeastern High School*	ATLAS Community
18. Denby High School*	Talent Development
19. Phoenix Academy*	Talent Development
20. Hosmer Elementary*	Microsociety
21. Parker Elementary*	Lightspan
22. Webber**	Lightspan
23. Mason Elementary*	Core Knowledge
24.Chandler**	Success for All

* Funded for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001
** Newly funded for 2000-2001

NOTE: Cooke and Cooper were funded for School Development in1999-2000 but did not reapply for the Michigan Department of Education CSRD funding for 2000-2001

As of 2000-2001, eight control schools became CSRD schools, leaving a total of 12 true control schools without CSRD models for the year 2000-2001. However, since these eight control schools did not have a CSRD model in the beginning stages of this evaluation (1998-99 and 1999-00), and were a part of the preliminary data gathering, they are included as control schools for this evaluation. **See Table 3.**

Table 3

Control Schools During 1999-2000 that Implemented a CSRD Model in 2000-2001

Control School Names	*Model Implemented*
Kettering	ATLAS Community
Boynton	ATLAS Community
Durfee	ATLAS Community
Greenfield Union	Direct Instruction
Hanstein	Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)
Logan	Comer/ATLAS Community
Monnier	Comer
Yost	Co-nect

Purpose of the Study

This study was developed to look at each CSRD model and answer the following four questions:

1. What are the similarities and/or differences in outcomes for schools involved in each of the nine CSRD models?
2. What is working and should be continued?
3. What is not working and should be discontinued?
4. What should be modified?

Methodology

This evaluation consists of six parts:

1. School Observation Measure (SOMe)
2. A School Climate Inventory (SCIe)
3. The Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQe)
4. Survey of Providers
5. Student Outcome Data – Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Grades 4 and 7 – Mathematics and Reading total school scores
6. Student Outcome Data – Metropolitan Achievement Test-7th Edition (MAT7) Grades 1-10 total school scores and individual student scores for students who were in the same school from 1998-1999 through 2000-2001 and those who were in the same school for fewer years.

1.0 School Observation Measure (SOMe) – This tool is a component of the CSRD formative evaluation conducted in partnership with Wayne State University and the University of Memphis - Center for Research in Educational Policy. Its purpose was to determine the extent to which different common and alternative teaching practices are used throughout an entire school. Trained staff from Detroit Public Schools and Wayne State University used the tool to record classroom observations. It used interval coding to describe practices employed by individual teachers. All 20 CSRD schools (1999-2000) along with 20 matched control schools were observed. The observation process consisted of:

- Four project observers per school.
- Each observer visited a total of 8-10 classrooms in15-minute intervals.
- Each observer stayed no longer than three hours in a single school visit.
- Observations occurred from October 2000 through May 2001

There were seven categories included in the observation:

- Instructional Orientation
- Classroom Organization
- Instructional Strategies
- Technology Use
- Assessment
- Summary Items

Dr. Steven M. Ross, from the University of Memphis – Center for Research in Educational Policy, conducted the project observation training for all observers. After the completion of an observation, the SOM's were sent to Dr. Ross for analysis and preparation of a final summary to be used as part of the evaluation. There are two phases of observations. In the first phase, 159 School Observation Measures (SOM) were completed with visits to approximately 1,600 classrooms during the month of October 2000 through May 2001. In the second phase, 144 SOM's will be conducted during the month of December 2001 through March 2002.

2.0 A School Climate Inventory (SCIe) – The SCI instrument was developed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. It was used to determine if there was school-based improvement planning in schools. The SCI consists of seven dimensions, or scales, logically and empirically linked with factors associated with effective school organizational climates. There are forty-nine items on the inventory, with seven comprising each scale. Responses were scored through the use of Likert-type ratings (strongly disagree-1 to strongly agree-5). Each scale had summative scores ranging from 7 to 35 with the higher scores being more positive. Both experimental and control schools involved in this study were asked to complete this survey.

The data were processed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy and are presented as a report from that organization later in this document. Schools involved

were assured anonymity as part of their participation in the SOMe and SCIe. Therefore, a "Data Summary and School Improvement Planning Guide" were sent to each individual principal participating in this study directly from the Center. Per agreement, each principal only received their own school's results, and the district did not receive individual school results, only summarized district results.

3.0 The **Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQe)** was developed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. It was used to determine the effects of the implementation of a reform model on a school. Teachers were asked to rate perceptions of progress toward the implementation of benchmark goals, and to provide open-ended comments regarding the positive and negative aspects of their school's Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program. The CSRTQe contained 28 items to which teachers responded using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Only those schools (20 experimental) who actually had a CSRD model funded in 1999-2000 with Michigan Department of Education CSRD grant funds were asked to complete this questionnaire.

The data were processed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy and are presented as a report from that organization later in this document.

4.0 The **Survey of Providers** was developed and conducted by the Detroit Public Schools Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. The purpose of this survey was to gather information on the perceptions of CSRD Model providers. The survey was a telephone survey conducted during the month of October 2001.

The telephone survey results were tabulated and displayed.

5.0 The **Staff Stability data** were to be included in the evaluation. However, only limited data were available through the Detroit Public School's Human Resource Department. Therefore, staff stability data are not included in this evaluation.

6.0 The **Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)** mathematics and reading scores, grades 4 and 7, for the school years 1998-1999 through 2000-2001 for both CSRD experimental schools and control schools were used as part of the evaluation. Whole school data showing the number and percent of students scoring in the satisfactory category were used. The school year 1998-1999 was the base year compared against 1999-2000 (1st year of CSRD implementation), and 2000-2001 (2nd year of CSRD implementation). This analysis compares student achievement in schools with a CSRD model with student achievement in schools without a CSRD model.

The data were tabulated and displayed.

7.0 The **Metropolitan Achievement Test- 7th Edition (MAT7)** mathematics and reading scores, grades 1 – 10 of both CSRD experimental and control schools for the school years 1998-1999 (base year), 1999-2000 (year 1) and 2000-2001 (year 2) were used as part of the evaluation of academic achievement. The MAT7 data were used in three ways:

1. Whole school data showing the number and percent of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile on the MAT.

2. Data for all students at each grade level who took the MAT7 at the **same school** in the spring, 1999, spring, 2000, and spring, 2001 were used. These data include, by experimental and control group, the number and percent of identified (3 years) students who were at or above the 50th percentile on the MAT7 in each year, and the percent of identified (less than 3 years) students who were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7 that same year.

3. A comparison analysis was completed by CSRD grant funded model. These data include, by model, the number and percent of identified (3 years) students who were at or above the 50th percentile on the MAT7 in each year, and the percent of identified (less than 3 years) students who were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7 that same year.

The data of whole school analysis were tabulated and displayed.

Findings/Conclusions

Data results of the ***School Observation Measure (SOMc), a School Climate Inventory (SCIc), and the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQc)*** were prepared by Dr. Steven Ross, from the University of Memphis – Center for Research in Educational Policy. The results are presented in ***Part 1*** of this report.

Part 2 of this report presents district level findings related to the ***Survey of Providers and Achievement Test Results from the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Metropolitan Achievement Test-7th Edition (MAT7).***

Part 1

Data Results

by
Steven M. Ross, Ph.D.,
The University of Memphis - Center for Research in Educational Policy

for the

School Observation Measure (SOMc), a School Climate Inventory (SCIc), and the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQc)

Data collection by Wayne State University,
Supervised by
Paula Woods, Ph.D., Dean, College of Education
and
Stephen Hillman, Ph.D., Professor, College of Education

Inferential Comparisons

for

Detroit Public Schools

Spring 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Detroit Research Schools and Models

Elementary Schools

- Clark – DWoK
- Cooke – School Development
- Cooper – School Development
- Detroit Open – Middle Start
- Grayling – School Development
- Hampton – DWoK
- Hosmer – Microsociety
- Mason – Core Knowledge
- Parker – Lightspan

Middle Schools

- Beaubien – School Development
- Coffey – ATLAS Community
- Lessenger – ATLAS Community
- McMichael – School Development
- Munger – Middle Start
- Phoenix Academy – Talent Development
- Winterhalter - CoNECT

High Schools

- Cody – ATLAS Community
- Denby – Talent Development
- Murray-Wright – ATLAS Community
- Southeastern – ATLAS Community

Detroit Control Schools

Elementary Schools

- Bagley
- Greenfield Union
- Hanstein
- Krolik
- Logan
- Ludington
- Lynch
- Monnier
- Van Zile
- Yost

Middle Schools

- Boynton
- Durfee
- Hampton
- Post
- Ruddman
- Sampson

High Schools

- Chadsey
- Finney
- Kettering
- Northwestern

Detroit Public Schools
2001 Data Summary Report

Section 1

CSRTQ Comparisons

Elementary Schools vs. Middle/High Schools

Elementary Schools vs. Middle Schools vs. High Schools

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

Elementary Schools vs. Middle/High Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQ©) comparing nine elementary research schools to eleven middle and high research schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed that the elementary schools had significantly higher levels of agreement than middle and high schools on all five of the scales. Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where *n* = number of participants within the schools:

- For the Professional Development Scale
  F (1, 257) = 20.819, $p < .001$, effect size = .55
  Elementary schools (n = 123, M = 3.610, SD = .902)
  Middle-High schools (n = 136, M = 3.013, SD = 1.170)

- For the Resources Scale
  F (1, 257) = 5.394, $p < .05$, effect size = .29
  Elementary schools (n = 122, M = 2.912, SD = .838)
  Middle-High schools (n = 137, M = 2.639, SD = 1.031)

- For the Pedagogical Changes Scale
  F (1, 246) = 6.485, $p < .05$, effect size = .32
  Elementary schools (n = 119, M = 2.940, SD = .787)
  Middle-High schools (n = 129, M = 2.665, SD = .900)

- For the Outcomes Scale
  F (1, 240) = 8.413, $p < .01$, effect size = .37
  Elementary schools (n = 113, M = 2.881, SD = .702)
  Middle-High schools (n = 129, M = 2.575, SD = .910)

- For the CSRD Scale
  F (1, 241) = 7.628, $p < .01$, effect size = .35
  Elementary schools (n = 117, M = 3.026, SD = .787)
  Middle-High schools (n = 126, M = 2.710, SD = .978)

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

Elementary Schools vs. Middle Schools vs. High Schools

Upon further investigation, it was revealed that the significant differences were between the nine elementary schools and the four high schools. The Resources Scale did not yield a significant difference for elementary vs. middle vs. high, therefore indicating the significant difference indicated above was due to the effect of middle and high being combined for comparison against elementary schools. The remaining four scales did however show that elementary schools had significantly higher levels of agreement than high schools ($\alpha = .05$).

- For the Professional Development Scale
  Elementary schools (n = 123, M = 3.610, SD = .902)
  High schools (n = 75, M = 2.833, SD = 1.158)

- For the Pedagogical Changes Scale
  Elementary schools (n = 119, M = 2.940, SD = .787)
  High schools (n = 71, M = 2.578, SD = .931)

- For the Outcomes Scale
  Elementary schools (n = 113, M = 2.881, SD = .702)
  High schools (n = 71, M = 2.532, SD = .972)

- For the CSRD Scale
  Elementary schools (n = 117, M = 3.026, SD = .787)
  High schools (n = 68, M = 2.644, SD = 1.016)

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQ©) comparing five comprehensive school reform models. Models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools regardless of grade level (Atlas, DWoK, Middle Start, School Development, and Talent Development). A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in four of the five CSRTQ Scales. Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (n = number of participants within schools)

- For the Professional Development Scale
  - DWoK and School Development were significantly higher than Atlas
  - DWoK and School Development were significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.9881	1.1390	63
DWoK	3.7151	.7472	43
Middle Start	3.1346	.8373	26
School Development	3.7744	.8400	41
Talent Development	2.8378	1.3271	37

- For the Resources Scale
  - No significant differences were found between the five models

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.7379	1.0055	62
DWoK	2.8631	.9471	42
Middle Start	2.6481	.8034	27
School Development	2.9679	.7972	39
Talent Development	2.4324	1.1206	37

- For the Pedagogical Changes Scale
  - DWoK was significantly higher than Atlas

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.5390	.9023	59
DWoK	3.0884	.7968	43
Middle Start	2.9600	.6758	25
School Development	2.8238	.6328	42
Talent Development	2.7143	1.0282	35

- For the Outcomes Scale
  - DWoK was significantly higher than Atlas

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.4627	.9244	59
DWoK	2.9921	.6466	38
Middle Start	2.8080	.6633	25
School Development	2.8902	.6844	41
Talent Development	2.5088	.9873	34

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

- For the CSRD Scale
  - DWoK was significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.7214	.9432	56
DWoK	3.2158	.7058	38
Middle Start	2.9000	.6911	26
School Development	3.0683	.7970	41
Talent Development	2.5429	1.0600	35

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models

The school models were further divided to represent a specific grade level (e.g., Atlas – Middle and Atlas – High). Each of the models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools of the same grade level (Atlas – Middle, Atlas – High, DWoK – Elementary, School Development – Elementary, and School Development – Middle). With an alpha level of .05, a one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in four of the five CSRTQ Scales. Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where *n* = number of participants within the schools:

- For the Professional Development Scale
  - Atlas – High was significantly lower than DWoK – Elementary, School Development – Elementary, and School Development – Middle

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	3.2031	1.2323	16
Atlas – High	2.9149	1.1098	47
DWoK – Elementary	3.7151	.7472	43
School Development – Elementary	3.7232	.8259	28
School Development – Middle	3.8846	.8934	13

- For the Resources Scale
  - No significant differences were found between the five models.

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	2.7500	1.0496	17
Atlas – High	2.7333	1.0006	45
DWoK – Elementary	2.8631	.9471	42
School Development – Elementary	2.8241	.7900	27
School Development – Middle	3.2917	.7449	12

- For the Pedagogical Changes Scale
  - DWoK – Elementary and School Development – Middle were significantly higher than Atlas – High

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	2.7467	.9546	15
Atlas – High	2.4682	.8839	44
DWoK – Elementary	3.0884	.7968	43
School Development – Elementary	2.6857	.6851	28
School Development – Middle	3.1000	.4057	14

2001 Detroit CSRTQ© Results

- For the Outcomes Scale
  - DWoK – Elementary and School Development – Middle were significantly higher than Atlas – Middle and Atlas – High

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	2.3733	.8787	15
Atlas – High	2.4932	.9473	44
DWoK – Elementary	2.9921	.6466	38
School Development – Elementary	2.7519	.6560	27
School Development – Middle	3.1571	.6813	14

- For the CSRD Scale
  - DWoK – Elementary and School Development – Middle were significantly higher than Atlas – High

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	2.8625	.8445	16
Atlas – High	2.6650	.9844	40
DWoK – Elementary	3.2158	.7058	38
School Development – Elementary	2.9286	.8059	28
School Development – Middle	3.3692	.7158	13

Detroit Public Schools
2001 Data Summary Report

Section 2

SCI Comparisons

Research Schools vs. Control Schools

Research Elementary Schools vs. Research Middle/High Schools

Elementary Schools vs. Middle Schools vs. High Schools (Research Schools)

Research Elementary Schools vs. Control Elementary Schools

Research Middle Schools vs. Control Middle Schools

Research High Schools vs. Control High Schools

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models for Research Schools

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models for Research Schools

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Research Schools vs. Control Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing twenty research schools to twenty control schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in only one of the seven scaled dimensions. *Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the control schools (M = 3.336) had a significantly higher level of agreement than the research schools (M = 3.205) on the Expectations Dimension, F (1, 581) = 3.902, p < .05, effect size = .16.

- Order Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	2.4473	.8359	274
Control Schools	2.4967	.9429	323

- Leadership Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.1533	.9265	273
Control Schools	3.2450	.9616	319

- Environment Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.0287	.8498	269
Control Schools	3.1062	.9132	327

- Involvement Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.3519	.7154	272
Control Schools	3.2321	.7850	309

- Instruction Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.6489	.5953	271
Control Schools	3.6367	.6202	311

- Expectation Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.2048	.7483	272
Control Schools	3.3358	.8400	311

- Collaboration Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.0792	.7850	274
Control Schools	3.1059	.8171	313

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Research Schools vs. Control Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing twenty research schools to twenty control schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in only one of the seven scaled dimensions. *Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the control schools (M = 3.336) had a significantly higher level of agreement than the research schools (M = 3.205) on the Expectations Dimension, $F(1, 581) = 3.902$, $p < .05$, effect size = .16.

- Order Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	2.4473	.8359	274
Control Schools	2.4967	.9429	323

- Leadership Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.1533	.9265	273
Control Schools	3.2450	.9616	319

- Environment Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.0287	.8498	269
Control Schools	3.1062	.9132	327

- Involvement Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.3519	.7154	272
Control Schools	3.2321	.7850	309

- Instruction Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.6489	.5953	271
Control Schools	3.6367	.6202	311

- Expectation Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.2048	.7483	272
Control Schools	3.3358	.8400	311

- Collaboration Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research Schools	3.0792	.7850	274
Control Schools	3.1059	.8171	313

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Elementary vs. Middle vs. High Schools (Research Schools)

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing nine elementary schools to seven middle schools and four high schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in the levels of agreement on five of the seven scaled dimensions (Order, Environment, Involvement, Expectation, and Collaboration). Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where *n* = number of participants within the schools:

- Order Dimension
  - Elementary Schools were significantly higher than High Schools

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	2.5412	.7733	123
Middle	2.5139	.7911	67
High	2.2568	.9319	84

- Leadership Dimension
  - No significant differences were found between the groups

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.2334	.8332	123
Middle	3.0277	.9655	67
High	3.1360	1.0204	83

- Environment Dimension
  - Elementary Schools were significantly higher than High Schools

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.1393	.7745	122
Middle	3.0794	.8559	63
High	2.8299	.9220	84

- Involvement Dimension
  - Elementary Schools were significantly higher than Middle Schools

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.4553	.6179	123
Middle	3.1834	.7926	67
High	3.3345	.7649	82

- Instruction Dimension
  - No significant differences were found between the groups

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.7302	.5272	126
Middle	3.5899	.6900	62
High	3.5697	.6083	83

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

- Expectation Dimension
  - Elementary Schools were significantly higher than High Schools
  - Middle Schools were significantly higher than High Schools

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.2997	.6327	123
Middle	3.2815	.8081	68
High	2.9965	.8225	81

- Collaboration Dimension
  - Elementary Schools were significantly higher than High Schools

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Elementary	3.2149	.7326	123
Middle	3.1126	.7954	66
High	2.8571	.8099	85

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Research Elementary Schools vs. Control Elementary Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing nine research elementary schools to ten control elementary schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in five of the seven scaled dimensions (Order, Leadership, Environment, Involvement, and Expectation). *Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the control elementary schools had a significantly higher level of agreement than the research elementary schools on the five indicated scales.

- Order Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.5412	.7733	123
Control	2.9595	.9716	120

- Leadership Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.2334	.8332	123
Control	3.6074	.9234	123

- Environment Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.1393	.7745	122
Control	3.3703	.8896	125

- Involvement Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.4553	.6179	123
Control	3.6274	.6908	120

- Instruction Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.7302	.5272	126
Control	3.7431	.6468	119

- Expectation Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.2997	.6327	123
Control	3.7071	.7782	119

- Collaboration Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.2149	.7326	123
Control	3.3813	.7991	121

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Research Middle Schools vs. Control Middle Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing seven research middle schools to six control middle schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference on only one of the seven scaled dimensions (Instruction). *Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the control middle schools had a significantly higher level of agreement than the research middle schools on the Instruction Scale.

- Order Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.5139	.7911	67
Control	2.3474	.8128	81

- Leadership Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.0277	.9655	67
Control	3.2189	.9732	77

- Environment Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.0794	.8559	63
Control	3.1807	.9207	83

- Involvement Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.1834	.7926	67
Control	3.3026	.6523	76

- Instruction Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.5899	.6900	62
Control	3.7909	.5275	82

- Expectation Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.2815	.8081	68
Control	3.3919	.7561	78

- Collaboration Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.1126	.7954	66
Control	3.1519	.8855	79

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Research High Schools vs. Control High Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing for research high schools to four control high schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference on only one of the seven scaled dimensions (Involvement). *Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the research high schools had a significantly higher level of agreement than the control high schools on the Involvement Scale.

- Order Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.2568	.9319	84
Control	2.1405	.8033	122

- Leadership Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.1360	1.0204	83
Control	2.8872	.8565	119

- Environment Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.8299	.9220	84
Control	2.7767	.8342	119

- Involvement Dimension*

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.3345	.7649	82
Control	2.7649	.7153	113

- Instruction Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	3.5697	.6083	83
Control	3.4065	.5921	110

- Expectation Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.9965	.8225	81
Control	2.9098	.7636	114

- Collaboration Dimension

Grade Level	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Research	2.8571	.8099	85
Control	2.7788	.6618	113

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models for Research Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Climate Inventory (SCI©) comparing five comprehensive school reform models. Models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools regardless of grade level (Atlas, DWoK, Middle Start, School Development, and Talent Development). A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in six of the seven scaled dimensions (Order, Leadership, Environment, Instruction, Expectation, and Collaboration). Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where *n* = number of participants within the schools:

- Order Dimension
  - DWoK was significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	2.4158	.8523	67
DWoK	2.7925	.7347	42
Middle Start	2.6455	.8075	27
School Development	2.4375	.7197	48
Talent Development	2.1321	.9192	40

- Leadership Dimension
  - The overall effect between the models was significant ($p = .047$), however
  - No significant differences were detected between the specific five models

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.2746	.9967	64
DWoK	3.4286	.7271	43
Middle Start	3.1058	.7171	27
School Development	3.2338	.9207	44
Talent Development	2.9136	.9804	43

- Environment Dimension
  - DWoK and School Development were significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.0286	.8058	65
DWoK	3.3766	.7401	44
Middle Start	3.1005	.7282	27
School Development	3.2127	.7642	45
Talent Development	2.6286	.9601	40

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

- Involvement Dimension
  - No significant differences were found between the five models

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.3326	.7725	64
DWoK	3.4592	.6082	42
Middle Start	3.3968	.5291	27
School Development	3.4911	.7379	48
Talent Development	3.2021	.8194	41

- Instruction Dimension
  - DWoK was significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.6094	.6958	64
DWoK	3.7565	.5368	44
Middle Start	3.6772	.4764	27
School Development	3.7305	.5749	44
Talent Development	3.3728	.6193	51

- Expectation Dimension
  - Atlas, DWoK, Middle Start, and School Development were significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.1837	.7236	63
DWoK	3.4728	.6446	42
Middle Start	3.4337	.6004	28
School Development	3.2828	.6724	46
Talent Development	2.7456	.8675	41

- Collaboration Dimension
  - DWoK, Middle Start, and School Development were significantly higher than Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	3.0330	.7405	65
DWoK	3.3275	.6383	41
Middle Start	3.2971	.7318	25
School Development	3.3750	.7076	48
Talent Development	2.6811	.8610	43

2001 Detroit SCI© Results

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models for Research Schools

The school models were further divided to represent a specific grade level (e.g., Atlas – Middle and Atlas – High). Each of the models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools of the same grade level (Atlas – Middle, Atlas – High, DWoK – Elementary, School Development – Elementary, and School Development – Middle). With an alpha level of .05, a one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in one of the seven scaled dimensions (Order). Based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where *n* = number of participants within the schools:

- Order Dimension
  - DWoK – Elementary was significantly higher than School Development - Elementary

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	2.5179	.6513	16
Atlas – High	2.3838	.9096	51
DWoK – Elementary	2.7925	.7347	42
School Development – Elementary	2.2811	.6603	31
School Development – Middle	2.7227	.7550	17

- Leadership Dimension
  - No significant differences were found between the five models.

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	3.1339	.9511	16
Atlas – High	3.3214	1.0168	48
DWoK – Elementary	3.4286	.7271	43
School Development – Elementary	3.2041	.8233	28
School Development – Middle	3.2857	1.0979	16

- Environment Dimension
  - No significant differences were found between the five models.

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	3.0204	.7085	14
Atlas – High	3.0308	.8371	51
DWoK – Elementary	3.3766	.7401	44
School Development – Elementary	3.1095	.5904	30
School Development – Middle	3.4190	1.0223	15

Detroit Public Schools
2001 Data Summary Report

Section 3

SOM Comparisons

Research Schools vs. Control Schools

Research Elementary Schools vs. Research Middle/High Schools

Elementary Schools vs. Middle Schools vs. High Schools (Research Schools)

Research Elementary Schools vs. Control Elementary Schools

Research Middle Schools vs. Control Middle Schools

Research High Schools vs. Control High Schools

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models for Research Schools

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models for Research Schools

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Research Schools vs. Control Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing twenty research schools to twenty control schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed that the research schools had significantly higher levels of occurrence than control schools during school observation visits in four areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Strategies) Integration of subject areas
  F (1, 231) = 4.607, p < .05, effect size = .30
  Research schools (n = 113, mean = .46)
  Control schools (n = 120, mean = .29)

- (Instructional Strategies) Project-based learning
  F (1, 227) = 5.059, p < .05, effect size = .35
  Research schools (n = 110, mean = .47)
  Control schools (n = 119, mean = .29)

- (Instructional Strategies) Use of higher-level questioning strategies
  F (1, 224) = 4.622, p < .05, effect size = .28
  Research schools (n = 109, mean = 1.64)
  Control schools (n = 117, mean = 1.28)

- (Technology Use) Computers used for instructional delivery
  F (1, 229) = 8.56, p < .01, effect size = .47
  Research schools (n = 111, mean = .31)
  Control schools (n = 120, mean = .13)

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Research Elementary Schools vs. Research Middle/High Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing the nine elementary schools to the eleven middle and high schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed that the elementary schools had significantly higher levels of occurrence than middle and high schools during school observation visits in three areas. Additionally, the analysis revealed that middle and high schools had significantly higher levels of occurrence than elementary schools during school observation visits in three areas (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Orientation) Team teaching
  F (1, 110) = 33.768, p < .001, effect size = .97
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .87)
  Middle and High schools (n = 66, mean = .11)

- (Classroom Organization) Work centers
  F (1, 110) = 10.761, p < .01, effect size = .60
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .65)
  Middle and High schools (n = 66, mean = .23)

- (Student Activities) Independent seatwork
  F (1, 111) = 5.623, p < .05, effect size = .44
  Middle and High schools (n = 67, mean = 3.10)
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = 2.63)

- (Student Activities) Experiential, hands-on learning
  F (1, 110) = 3.936, p = .05, effect size = .37
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .87)
  Middle and High schools (n = 66, mean = .55)

- (Student Activities) Independent inquiry / research on the part of the students
  F (1, 111) = 6.595, p < .05, effect size = .48
  Middle and High schools (n = 67, mean = .24)
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .00)

- (Technology Use) Technology as a learning tool or resource
  F (1, 111) = 4.553, p < .05, effect size = .41
  Middle and High schools (n = 67, mean = .75)
  Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .41)

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Elementary vs. Middle vs. High Schools (Research Schools)

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing the nine elementary schools to seven middle schools and four high schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant in six areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Orientation) Team teaching
- Elementary schools significantly higher than Middle schools and High schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .87)
  - Middle schools (n = 41, mean = .10)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = .12)

- (Classroom Organization) Multi-age Grouping
- High schools significantly higher than Elementary schools and Middle schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .17)
  - Middle schools (n = 41, mean = .22)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = .84)

- (Classroom Organization) Work centers
- Elementary schools significantly higher than Middle schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .65)
  - Middle schools (n = 41, mean = .20)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = .28)

- (Student Activities) Independent seatwork
- Middle schools significantly higher than Elementary schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = 2.63)
  - Middle schools (n = 42, mean = 3.26)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = 2.84)

- (Student Activities) Experiential, hands-on learning
- Elementary schools significantly higher than High schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .87)
  - Middle schools (n = 41, mean = .71)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = .28)

- (Student Activities) Independent inquiry / research on the part of the students
- Middle schools significantly higher than Elementary schools and High schools
  - Elementary schools (n = 46, mean = .00)
  - Middle schools (n = 42, mean = .36)
  - High schools (n = 25, mean = .04)

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Research Elementary Schools vs. Control Elementary Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing the nine research elementary schools to ten control elementary schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant in six areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Orientation) Team teaching
- Research schools significantly higher than Control schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = .87)
  Control schools (n = 60, mean = .40)

- (Classroom Organization) Ability Groups
- Control schools significantly higher than Research schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = .24)
  Control schools (n = 57, mean = .60)

- (Student Activities) Independent inquiry / research on the part of the students
- Control schools significantly higher than Research schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = .00)
  Control schools (n = 60, mean = .13)

- (Technology Use) Computers for instructional delivery
- Research schools significantly higher than Control schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = .33)
  Control schools (n = 60, mean = .08)

- (Summary Item) Academically focused class time (1 – 3 Scale: 1 = Low, 2 = Moderate, and 3 = High)
- Control schools significantly higher than Research schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = 2.35)
  Control schools (n = 59, mean = 2.59)

- (Summary Item) Level of student attention/interest/engagement (1 – 3 Scale: 1 = Low, 2 = Moderate, and 3 = High)
- Control schools significantly higher than Research schools
  Research schools (n = 46, mean = 2.22)
  Control schools (n = 59, mean = 2.51)

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Research Middle Schools vs. Control Middle Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing the seven research middle schools to six control middle schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant in three areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)). Research schools were significantly higher than Control schools in all three of the indicated areas.

- (Instructional Strategies) Project-based learning
- Research schools were significantly higher than Control schools
  Research schools (n = 41, mean = .68)
  Control schools (n = 37, mean = .22)

- (Technology Use) Computers for instructional delivery
- Research schools significantly higher than Control schools
  Research schools (n = 42, mean = .33)
  Control schools (n = 37, mean = .11)

- (Summary Item) Academically focused class time (1 – 3 Scale: 1 = Low, 2 = Moderate, and 3 = High)
- Research schools significantly higher than Control schools
  Research schools (n = 42, mean = 2.45)
  Control schools (n = 36, mean = 2.14)

Research High Schools vs. Control High Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing the four research high schools to four control high schools. A one-way analysis of variance revealed ***no significant differences between the groups*** in any of the areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Comparison of Five Comprehensive School Reform Models for Research Schools

An alpha level of .05 was used for the statistical analysis for the School Observation Measure (SOM©) comparing five comprehensive school reform models. Models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools regardless of grade level (Atlas, DWoK, Middle Start, School Development, and Talent Development). A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in seven of the areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Orientation) Team teaching
- DWoK was significantly higher than ATLAS, School Development, and Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.0968	.30	31
DWoK	1.33	.87	9
Middle Start	.50	.90	12
School Development	.30	.78	27
Talent Development	.17	.39	12

- (Instructional Orientation) Cooperative/Collaborative Learning
- DWoK and Middle Start were significantly higher than School Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.55	.62	31
DWoK	1.13	.83	8
Middle Start	1.08	.79	12
School Development	.37	.49	27
Talent Development	.67	.65	12

- (Instructional Orientation) Individual Tutoring
- Middle Start was significantly higher than ATLAS and School Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.29	.53	31
DWoK	.33	.50	9
Middle Start	1.00	1.21	12
School Development	.12	.33	26
Talent Development	.50	.90	12

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

- (Classroom Organization) Multi-age Grouping
- The overall effect between the models was significant ($p = .016$), however
- No significant differences were detected between the specific five models

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.45	.85	31
DWoK	.00	.00	9
Middle Start	.67	.89	12
School Development	.15	.78	26
Talent Development	.83	.94	12

- (Instructional Strategies) Integration of subject areas
- DWoK was significantly higher than ATLAS, School Development, and Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.35	.55	31
DWoK	1.22	.83	9
Middle Start	.67	.65	12
School Development	.41	.64	27
Talent Development	.42	.67	12

- (Student Activities) Experiential, hands-on learning
- DWoK was significantly higher than ATLAS, School Development, and Talent Development

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.48	.77	31
DWoK	1.78	1.30	9
Middle Start	.92	.67	12
School Development	.59	.89	27
Talent Development	.33	.49	12

- (Technology Use) Technology as a learning tool or resource
- The overall effect between the models was significant ($p = .012$), however
- No significant differences were detected between the specific five models

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas	.81	.91	31
DWoK	.22	.44	9
Middle Start	1.17	1.03	12
School Development	.37	.74	27
Talent Development	.83	.58	12

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

Comparison of Grade-Level School Models for Research Schools

The school models were further divided to represent a specific grade level (e.g., Atlas – Middle and Atlas – High). Each of the models used for comparison were represented by at least two schools of the same grade level (Atlas – Middle, Atlas – High, DWoK – Elementary, School Development – Elementary, and School Development – Middle). With an alpha level of .05, a one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences in five of the areas. (Based on a scale of 0 (not observed) to 4 (observed extensively)).

- (Instructional Orientation) Team teaching
- DWoK – Elementary was significantly higher than ATLAS – Middle, ATLAS – High, School Development – Elementary, and School Development - Middle

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	.08	.28	13
Atlas – High	.11	.32	18
DWoK – Elementary	1.33	.87	9
School Development – Elementary	.44	.96	16
School Development – Middle	.09	.30	11

- (Instructional Orientation) Cooperative/Collaborative Learning
- DWoK – Elementary was significantly higher than School Development - Middle

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	.62	.77	13
Atlas – High	.50	.51	18
DWoK – Elementary	1.13	.83	8
School Development – Elementary	.44	.51	16
School Development – Middle	.27	.47	11

- (Classroom Organization) Multi-age Grouping
- ATLAS – High was significantly higher than ATLAS – Middle, DWoK – Elementary, and School Development – Elementary

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	.08	.28	13
Atlas – High	.72	1.02	18
DWoK – Elementary	.00	.00	9
School Development – Elementary	.00	.00	16
School Development – Middle	.40	1.26	10

2001 Detroit SOM© Results

- (Instructional Strategies) Integration of subject areas
- DWoK – Elementary was significantly higher than ATLAS – Middle, ATLAS – High, and School Development - Elementary

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	.31	.48	13
Atlas – High	.39	.61	18
DWoK – Elementary	1.22	.83	9
School Development – Elementary	.19	.40	16
School Development – Middle	.73	.79	11

- (Student Activities) Experiential, hands-on learning
- DWoK – Elementary was significantly higher than ATLAS – High and School Development - Elementary

School Model	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Atlas – Middle	.77	1.01	13
Atlas – High	.28	.46	18
DWoK – Elementary	1.78	1.30	9
School Development – Elementary	.38	.50	16
School Development – Middle	.91	1.22	11

Part 2

Data Results

by

Regina Thomas, Ph.D., Evaluator
Detroit Public Schools - Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment

for the

Survey of Providers

and

Achievement Test Results – Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Metropolitan Achievement Test-7th Edition (MAT7)

Survey of Providers

A total of nine CSRD providers were surveyed by telephone during the month of October 2001. The providers surveyed were:

	CSRD Model	School Serviced
1.	ATLAS Community	Cody HS Coffey Lessenger Murray-Wright HS Southeastern HS
2.	Co-nect	Winterhalter
3.	Core Knowledge	Mason Elementary
4.	Different Ways of Knowing	Clark Elementary Hampton Elementary
5.	Lightspan	Parker Elementary
6.	Microsociety	Hosmer Elementary
7.	Middle Start	Detroit Open Munger Middle
8.	School Development	Beaubien Middle Cooke Elementary Cooper Elementary Grayling McMichael Middle
9.	Talent Development	Denby HS Phoenix Academy

Findings from the telephone survey showed that 6 of the 9 providers (67%) had reached a contract agreement with their school(s) in 1998-1999, and 3 of the 9 providers (33%) had reached a contract agreement in 1999-2000. Four of the nine providers (44%) started providing actual services to the schools between the Fall 1998 and January 2000. The support service provided to the schools by the model providers varied- 95% on-site visits, 90% monitoring by the provider, 85% off-site visits, 85% professional development, 80% teacher-training workshops, 80% consultation, 70% school improvement monitoring, 65% parent involvement, 65% newsletter, 60% technology assistance, and 45% indicated other.

All nine-model providers (100%) indicated that teachers were trained in the model. When asked how many hours of training have you provided to a school? The results are as follows:

1. **ATLAS Community**
   - *Cody High School* – "65 hours"
   - *Coffey Middle School* – "Ongoing-Bimonthly professional development on site via whole faculty"
   - *Lessenger Middle School* – "75+ hours"
   - *Murray-Wright High School* – "Biweekly professional development via whole faculty study groups"
   - *Southeastern High School* – "65 hours"
2. **Co-nect**
   - *Winterhalter* – "18 hours of full staff workshops"
3. **Core Knowledge**
   - *Mason Elementary* – "50 hours"
4. **Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)**
   - *Clark Elementary* – "78 hours"
   - *Hampton Elementary* – "78+ hours"
5. **Lightspan**
   - *Parker Elementary* – "over 1,000 hours"
6. **Microsociety**
   - *Hosmer Elementary* – "220 hours"
7. **Middle Start**
   - *Detroit Open* – "900 hours"
   - *Munger Middle* – "900 hours"
8. **School Development**
   - *Beaubien Middle* – "1 week"
   - *Cooke Elementary* – "1 week"
   - *Cooper Elementary* – "1 week"
   - *Grayling Elementary* – "Ongoing"
   - *McMichael Middle* – "15 hours"
9. **Talent Development**
   - *Denby High School* – "20 hours"
   - *Phoenix Academy* – "80 hours"

Six of the nine model providers (67%) felt the level of teacher readiness for the model process was moderate, 2 of the 9 model providers (22%) said "low", and one provider (11%) indicated teacher readiness was high.

Three of the nine providers (33%) felt that their schools had 75-100% staff involvement in the model. Three of the nine providers (33%) felt that their schools had 50-75% staff involvement in the model. Another 2 of 9 providers (22%) felt that their school had 25-50% staff involvement in the model. Finally, 1 of the 9 providers (11%) felt that the schools had 0-25% staff involvement in the model. **See Table 4.**

Table 4

Whole-School Involvement in the CSRD Model

# of Provider Responses	% of Provider Responses	Range of Involvement
1	11%	0-25%
2	22%	25-50%
3	33%	50-75%
3	33%	75-100%

*Percent may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Thirty-three percent of the model providers (3 of 9 providers) were very satisfied with the amount of contact between the provider and the school, 33% (3 of 9 providers) were satisfied, 22% neutral or not sure (2 of 9 providers), 11% were dissatisfied (1 of 9 providers), and there were no model provider very dissatisfied. Over 50% of the model providers 67%, (6 of 9 providers), said "yes" that the school followed through on the implementation process of the model, and listed major factors that promoted implementation. These are presented below.

- Administrative support
- Staff readiness
- Teacher development and understanding of the model
- A strong Title I coordinator
- On-site person availability
- All teams involved
- A teaming principal who openly collaborates for student success
- Willingness of leadership teams to work after school
- Staff participation
- Materials and in-service
- On-site technical assistance
- Model providers availability
- Staff and administrator very strong and well organized
- Address problems as a group-teamwork
- Follow through on implementation

- Student achievement, parent involvement, and professional development as top priority

Less than half (44%), 4 of 9 providers indicated "no" to the school following through on the implementation process of the model. The problem was described as:

- Change in administration
- New administration at the local school not taking ownership of the old administration initiative
- School dropping the model in 1999-2000
- Lack of a full-time coordinator
- Lack of continued leadership team
- Hands-off approach by principal
- Lack of materials in schools

Three of the nine providers (33%) felt good about how the school perceived the *value* of the services that they provided, 33% (3 of 9 providers) excellent, 22% fair (2 of 9 providers), 11% average (1 of 9 providers), and none of the providers felt poor.

Fifty-six percent (5 of 9 providers) felt good about how the school perceived the *quality* of the services that they provided, 22% (2 of 9 providers), excellent, 11% (1 of 9 providers) poor, 11% (1 of 9 providers) average, and no provider felt fair. See **Appendix 5** for a sample of the Providers Telephone Survey.

Achievement Test Results – Total Group Data

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Total group results for three years for the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) tests are presented on **Tables 5 and 6**. Results of the Grades 4 and 7 reading and mathematics tests administered in the base year (1998-1999) and the tests administered in 1999-2000 (year 1) and 2000-2001 (year 2) show the following.

- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, there was a 23.1 increase in the percent of Grade 4 students attaining satisfactory reading scores at the 10 control schools while there was a 5.9 decrease in the percent of students attaining satisfactory reading scores at the 14 experimental (CSRD) schools.

- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, the change in the percent of Grade 4 students attaining satisfactory mathematics scores was essentially the same for the 10 control schools (0.9% increase) and the 14 experimental schools (0.1% decrease).

- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, the results for Grade 7 reading were identical for both the control and experimental schools. There was an 11.1 decrease in the percent of Grade 7 students attaining satisfactory reading scores at both the 7 control and 8 experimental schools.

- The Grade 7 mathematics test was discontinued by the state in 2000-2001. Data from 1998-1999 to 1999-2000 show a 0.1 increase in the percent of Grade 7 students attaining satisfactory scores in the 7 control schools and a 6.1 increase in the percent of students attaining satisfactory scores in the 8 experimental (CSRD) schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Special Note: The school sample sizes varied in the control and experimental groups because of grade configurations at each school. For example, a K-4 grade school will have only a grade 4 MEAP score, and a K-8 grade school will have MEAP scores in grades 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Table 5
Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Total Group Results
1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001
Grade 4 Reading and Mathematics

10 Control Schools with Grade 4							*14 Experimental Schools with Grade 4*					
		Reading (Satisfactory)			Mathematics (Satisfactory)			Reading (Satisfactory)			Mathematics (Satisfactory)	
Year	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%
1998-99	651	260	39.9	650	356	54.8	1262	417	33.0	1286	466	36.2
1999-00	661	410	62.0	659	376	57.1	1342	464	34.6	1317	639	48.5
Difference			*22.1*			*2.3*			*1.6*			*12.3*
2000-01	646	407	63.0	648	361	55.7	1233	334	27.1	1237	446	36.1
Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01			*1.0*			*-1.4*			*-7.5*			*-12.4*
Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01			*23.1*			*0.9*			*-5.9*			*-0.1*

Table 6
Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Total Group Results
1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001
Grade 7 Reading and Mathematics

10 Control Schools with Grade 7							*14 Experimental Schools with Grade 7*					
		Reading (Satisfactory)			Mathematics (Satisfactory)			Reading (Satisfactory)			Mathematics (Satisfactory)	
Year	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%	# Tested	N	%
1998-99	854	361	42.3	856	331	38.7	1400	488	34.9	1366	408	29.9
1999-00	920	503	54.7	912	354	38.8	1339	379	28.3	1293	465	36.0
Difference			*12.4*			*0.1*			*-6.6*			*+6.1*
2000-01	930	290	31.2		*No Test*		1381	328	23.8		*No Test*	
Difference 1999-00 to 2000-01			*-23.5*						*-4.5*			
Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01			*-11.1*						*-11.1*			

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Total Group Scores of Control and Experimental Schools for 1998-1999 to 2000-2001 Results

The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) was administered to all students in Grades 1-10 in the spring of each year. **Tables 7 and 8** present, by grade and for the total group, the percents of students at or above the 50th percentile in reading and mathematics for both the control and experimental schools. A brief summarization of the data follows.

READING

Both the control and experimental schools experienced declines in the percents of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between the base year (1998-1999) and 2000-2001. The decline in control schools was 3.6 percent (from 27.2% to 23.6%). For the experimental schools, the decline was 7.0 percent (from 27.8% to 20.8%). For the district as a whole, there was a decrease of 3 percent in the percent of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between 1998-1999 and 2000-2001.

MATHEMATICS

Both control and experimental schools experienced small gains in the percents of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between the base year (1998-1999) and 2000-2001. The gain in control schools was 1.9 percent (from 25.3% to 27.2%) while in the experimental schools, the gain was 0.5 percent (from 21.6% to 22.1%). For the district as a whole, there was a decrease of 1 percent in the percent of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile between 1998-1999 and 2000-2001.

Table 7

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Total Group Results
1998-1999 to 2000-2001
READING

		Control Schools								*Experimental Schools*							
		Number Tested and % at or above 50th Percentile						Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01		Number Tested and % at or above 50th Percentile						Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01	
Grade	*Number of Schools*	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01			*Number of Schools*	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01			
		N	%	N	%	N	%			N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	12	939	39.2	850	37.2	828	45.3	6.1	13	1278	43.2	1170	38.2	1066	44.3	1.1	
2	12	973	33.2	812	33.0	796	39.9	6.7	13	1392	26.6	1159	29.2	1070	27.9	1.3	
3	12	965	39.9	846	35.2	847	30.8	-9.1	14	1479	27.0	1391	24.2	1213	27.4	0.4	
4	12	831	30.8	874	32.2	785	23.7	-7.1	14	1297	27.1	1365	20.3	1220	18.1	-9.0	
5	13	899	28.9	891	30.3	963	27.6	-1.3	15	1104	23.6	1200	24.3	1224	17.9	-5.7	
6	9	894	31.8	845	24.1	827	18.3	-13.5	10	1278	21.8	1312	29.0	1359	23.0	1.2	
7	7	891	24.0	938	22.3	950	16.8	-7.2	9	1408	30.3	1373	16.7	1386	16.5	-13.8	
8	7	999	27.0	1007	21.6	805	25.6	-1.4	9	1439	27.0	1422	40.2	1306	22.6	-4.4	
9	5	1264	11.8	1251	14.2	1133	7.4	-4.4	6	1776	14.4	1818	14.1	1814	10.9	-3.5	
10	4	794	7.4	779	5.5	872	8.6	1.2	5	1374	12.7	1401	15.3	1412	9.7	-3.0	
Total		*9449*	*27.2*	*9093*	*25.1*	*8806*	*23.6*	*-3.6*		*12451*	*27.8*	*13611*	*24.5*	*13070*	*20.8*	*-7.0*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

<u>Special Note:</u> The school sample sizes varied in the control and experimental groups because of grade configurations at each school. For example, an elementary and/or middle school may have had a grade level of K-5 or K-8, so therefore the number of schools that the MAT test was given varied depending on the grade level.

Table 8

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Total Group Results
1998-1999 to 2000-2001
MATHEMATICS

		Control Schools							*Experimental Schools*							
		Number Tested and % at or above 50th Percentile						Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01		Number Tested and % at or above 50th Percentile						Difference 1998-99 to 2000-01
Grade	*Number of Schools*	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01			*Number of Schools*	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01		
		N	%	N	%	N	%			N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	12	982	31.7	857	32.6	843	38.6	7.5	13	1286	29.2	1203	29.2	1087	34.4	8.4
2	12	976	35.6	845	36.8	817	44.9	9.3	13	1346	27.2	1186	30.0	1072	33.8	6.6
3	12	958	34.4	849	35.3	839	31.7	-2.7	14	1475	19.3	1381	22.2	1196	23.1	3.8
4	12	827	31.2	873	31.5	784	27.6	-3.6	14	1294	21.4	1354	26.1	1211	22.5	1.1
5	13	897	32.0	889	34.5	960	30.7	-1.3	15	1096	22.1	1195	23.8	1198	21.6	-0.5
6	9	892	19.5	836	22.1	820	15.4	-4.1	10	1282	11.2	1304	11.7	1336	11.7	0.5
7	7	884	26.4	924	21.3	946	22.0	-4.4	9	1377	23.3	1363	21.1	1354	19.5	-3.8
8	7	994	17.4	1003	26.8	799	22.0	4.6	9	1427	23.1	1415	30.3	1290	14.6	-8.5
9	5	1264	17.9	1252	25.2	1139	24.4	6.5	6	1792	24.0	1836	23.5	1814	25.1	1.1
10	4	782	7.4	793	14.0	871	15.7	8.3	5	1366	14.5	1412	16.6	1412	17.8	3.3
Total		*9456*	*25.3*	*9121*	*28.0*	*8818*	*27.2*	*1.9*		*13741*	*21.6*	*13649*	*23.4*	*12970*	*22.1*	*0.5*

Special Note: The school sample sizes varied in the control and experimental groups because of grade configurations at each school. For example, an elementary and/or middle school may have had a grade level of K-5 or K-8, so therefore the number of schools that the MAT test was given varied depending on the grade level.

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Scores of Control and Experimental Schools for 1998-1999 to 2000-2001 Results

In this section, Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) scores for students who attended a control or experimental school for three consecutive years (1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-01) are compared with three years of scores for students who attended a control or experimental school for less than three years.

READING

Comparing the reading data of students in the same school for less than 3 years with the data of students in the same school for three consecutive years (1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001) there was a decrease in the percent of students scoring at and above the 50th percentile on MAT7 in reading for both the control schools and experimental schools. The decrease was greater for students in the same school for 3-years than was the decrease for students in the same school for less than 3-years for both the control schools and experimental schools. However, the percents of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile was greater for the more stable students (3 years) than the less stable students (less than three years). In addition, the percents of stable students at or above the 50th percentile in 2000-01 was about the same in the control and experimental schools. Similarly, the percents of less stable students at or above the 50th percentile in 2000-01 was approximately the same in the control and experimental schools. **See Table 9.**

- In 2000-01, 24.6% of students in 19 experimental (CSRD) schools who had 3 years of reading test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 19.6% of students in 19 experimental (CSRD) schools who did not have 3 years of reading test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 25.7% of students in 18 control schools who had 3 years of reading test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 18.5% of students in 18 control schools who did not have 3 years of reading test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7. **See Table 10.**

Table 9
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Results in Reading
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

Data Summary Control Schools	N of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Reading Less than 3 Years	18	7584	1553	20.5	7158	1437	20.1	7037	1299	18.5
Reading 3 Consecutive Years	18	2236	847	37.9	2236	727	32.5	2236	574	25.7
Data Summary Experimental Schools	**N of Schools Involved**	**N Tested 98-99**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**	**N Tested 99-00**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**	**N Tested 00-01**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**
Reading Less than 3 Years	19	9299	2013	21.6	9269	2255	24.3	8622	1686	19.6
Reading 3 Consecutive Years	19	2455	796	32.4	2455	646	26.3	2455	603	24.6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Less than 3 years data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for one year and who also took the MAT7 that same year.
*Three Consecutive years' data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

Table 10
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7)
Individual Student Reading Results
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

Reading Less Than 3 Years

18 Control Schools

School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Boynton	404	144	20.8
Logan	361	104	28.8
Chaney	322	35	10.9
Simpson	288	71	24.7
Ruddiman	422	46	10.9
Northwestern	654	38	5.8
Yost	78	18	23.1
Ludington	367	176	48.0
Bagley	305	103	33.8
Durfee	610	142	23.3
Hampton MS	384	41	10.7
Post	628	48	7.6
Greenfield Union	293	84	28.7
Lynch	130	17	13.1
Van Zile	368	143	38.9
Kettering	727	28	3.9
Kreiki	112	14	12.5
Finney	584	47	8.0
Hamtramck	0	0	0.0
Monroe	0	0	0.0
Total	*7037*	*1299*	*18.5*

19 Experimental Schools

School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Beaubien	627	92	14.7
Greyfieg	211	62	29.4
Cody	767	69	9.0
Winterhalter	620	231	37.3
Munger	563	134	23.8
Southeastern	463	43	9.3
Phoenix	350	32	9.1
Hampton ES	403	71	17.6
Clark	505	134	26.5
Coffey	325	40	12.3
Lessenger	658	72	10.9
McMichael	315	53	16.8
Cooke	270	126	46.7
Hosmer	263	47	17.9
Parker	471	125	26.5
Murray-Wright	728	90	12.4
Detroit Open	161	33	20.5
Dunby	0	0	0.0
Cooper	482	122	25.3
Mason	440	110	25.0
Total	*8632*	*1686*	*19.6*

Note: Less than 3 years data reflect students who were enrolled in a school for one year and who also took the MAT7 for that same year.

Reading 3 Years

18 Control Schools

School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Boynton	237	93	39.2
Logan	171	58	33.9
Chaney	2	1	50.0
Simpson	162	25	15.4
Ruddiman	101	18	17.8
Northwestern	3	0	0.0
Yost	48	16	33.3
Ludington	257	101	39.3
Bagley	245	75	30.6
Durfee	295	59	20.0
Hampton MS	70	8	11.4
Post	87	18	20.7
Greenfield Union	129	32	24.8
Lynch	58	13	22.4
Van Zile	257	47	18.3
Kettering	59	4	6.8
Kreiki	53	6	11.3
Finney	2	0	0.0
Hamtramck	0	0	0.0
Monroe	0	0	0.0
Total	*2236*	*574*	*25.7*

19 Experimental Schools

School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Beaubien	144	23	16.0
Greyfieg	117	11	9.4
Cody	0	0	0.0
Winterhalter	255	88	34.5
Munger	107	32	29.9
Southeastern	1	0	0.0
Phoenix	86	16	18.6
Hampton ES	206	34	16.5
Clark	236	56	23.7
Coffey	89	21	23.6
Lessenger	148	31	21.0
McMichael	65	15	23.1
Cooke	141	66	46.8
Hosmer	131	32	24.4
Parker	176	43	24.4
Murray-Wright	0	0	0.0
Detroit Open	129	49	38.0
Dunby	0	0	0.0
Cooper	188	31	16.5
Mason	236	55	23.3
Total	*2455*	*683*	*24.6*

Note: Three years' data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MATHEMATICS

Comparing the mathematics data of less than 3 years with the data of three consecutive years results, for all three years (1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001) there was a decrease in the percent of students scoring at and above the 50th percentile on MAT7 in mathematics for both the control schools and the experimental schools. The decrease was greater for students in the same school for 3-years than was the decrease for students in the same school for less than 3-years for both the control schools and experimental schools. However, as with reading, while the decreases were greater for the more stable students, these more stable students continuously outperformed the less stable students. **See Table 11.**

- In 2000-01, 22.2% of students in 19 experimental (CSRD) schools who had 3 years of mathematics test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 19.6% of students in 19 experimental (CSRD) schools who did not have 3 years of mathematics test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 28.5% of students in 18 control schools who had 3 years of mathematics test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7.

- In 2000-01, 22.3% of students in 18 control schools who did not have 3 years of mathematics test scores in the same school were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7. **See Table 12.**

Table 9 and Table 11 shows that the number and percent of schools in which students with 3 years of same school attendance outperformed students with less than 3 years same school attendance in both reading and mathematics for the control schools and experimental schools.

Table 11
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Results in Mathematics
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

Data Summary Control Schools	N of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Math Less than 3 Years	18	7584	1553	20.5	7158	1769	24.7	7037	1572	22.3
Math 3 Consecutive Years	18	2236	658	29.4	2236	688	30.8	2236	637	28.5
Data Summary Experimental Schools	**N of Schools Involved**	**N Tested 98-99**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**	**N Tested 99-00**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**	**N Tested 00-01**	**N At/Above 50th Percentile**	**% At/Above 50th Percentile**
Math Less than 3 Years	19	9299	1716	18.5	9269	2004	21.6	8622	1693	19.6
Math 3 Consecutive Years	19	2455	568	23.1	2455	650	26.5	2455	546	22.3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Less than 3 years data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for one year and who also took the MAT7 that same year.
'Three Consecutive years' data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

Table 12
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7)
Individual Student Mathematics Results
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

Mathematics Less Than 3 Years

18 Control Schools				19 Experimental Schools			
School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Boynton	404	125	30.9	Beaubien	627	118	18.8
Logan	361	132	36.6	Greyling	211	58	27.5
Chadsey	322	92	28.6	Cody	767	162	21.1
Sampson	288	82	28.5	Winterhalter	620	107	17.3
Ruddiman	422	39	9.2	Munger	563	69	12.3
Northwestern	654	113	17.3	Southeastern	463	80	17.3
Yost	78	12	15.4	Phoenix	350	31	8.6
Ludington	367	138	37.6	Hampton ES	403	60	14.9
Bagley	305	90	29.5	Clark	505	145	28.7
Durfee	610	123	20.2	Coffey	325	32	9.8
Hampton MS	384	59	15.4	Lessenger	658	78	11.9
Post	628	61	9.7	McMichael	315	15	4.8
Greenfield Union	293	109	37.2	Cooke	270	119	44.1
Lynch	130	18	13.9	Hosmer	263	37	14.1
Van Zile	368	174	47.3	Parker	471	156	33.1
Kettering	727	76	10.5	Murray-Wright	728	183	25.1
Krolik	112	16	14.3	Detroit Open	161	34	21.1
Finney	584	113	19.4	Denby	0	0	0.0
Hamtramck	0	0	0.0	Cooper	482	82	17.0
Monnier	0	0	0.0	Mason	440	127	28.9
Total	*7037*	*1572*	*22.3*	*Total*	*8622*	*1693*	*19.6*

Note: Less than 3 years data reflect students who were enrolled in a school for one year and who also took the MAT7 for that same year.

Mathematics 3 Years

18 Control Schools				19 Experimental Schools			
School Name	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	School Name	N Tested 00-01	N/ At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile
Boynton	237	80	33.8	Beaubien	144	61	42.4
Logan	171	78	45.6	Greyling	117	17	14.5
Chadsey	2	1	50.0	Cody	0	0	0.0
Sampson	162	42	25.9	Winterhalter	255	54	21.2
Ruddiman	101	10	9.9	Munger	107	11	10.3
Northwestern	3	0	0.0	Southeastern	1	0	0.0
Yost	48	20	41.7	Phoenix	86	8	9.3
Ludington	257	108	42.0	Hampton ES	206	19	9.2
Bagley	245	68	27.8	Clark	236	68	28.8
Durfee	295	33	11.2	Coffey	89	14	15.7
Hampton MS	70	24	34.3	Lessenger	148	23	15.5
Post	87	13	14.9	McMichael	65	2	3.1
Greenfield Union	129	45	34.9	Cooke	141	75	53.2
Lynch	58	10	17.2	Hosmer	131	21	16.0
Van Zile	257	92	35.8	Parker	176	47	26.7
Kettering	59	10	17.0	Murray-Wright	0	0	0.0
Krolik	53	3	5.7	Detroit Open	129	42	32.6
Finney	2	0	0.0	Denby	0	0	0.0
Hamtramck	0	0	0.0	Cooper	188	26	13.8
Monnier	0	0	0.0	Mason	236	58	24.6
Total	*2236*	*637*	*28.5*	*Total*	*2455*	*431*	*22.2*

Note: Three years' data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Results by Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Model for Control and Experimental Schools for 1998-1999 to 2000-2001

Tables 13 – 16 show test score data for control and experimental schools by models.

The ***less than 3 years*-Tables 13 and 15** reflect results by CSRD Models of all students who were enrolled in the same school for less than three years and also took the MAT7.

The ***three consecutive years*-Tables 14 and 16** reflect results by CSRD Models of all students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years, and also took the MAT7 for the same three years.

READING

A comparison analysis was completed by CSRD grant funded model using the data of identified 3 years students and identified less than 3 year students who were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7 in reading. The difference between the base year (1998-1999) and year 2 (2000-2001) was calculated. In addition to differences, overall trend data were reviewed and are presented.

ATLAS Community

- ***Control Schools*** - The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-9.1%, n of schools involved = 5) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-4.7%, n of schools involved = 5).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a decline in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (-3.9%, n of schools involved = 5) and for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-3.8%, n of schools involved = 3).

Co-nect

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled for less than 3 years (+10.5%, n of schools involved = 1), as compared to the student achievement staying the same for those students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (0.0%, n of schools involved = 1).

- ***Experimental Schools*** –The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+5.1%, n of schools involved = 1), but a decrease of –3.7% for students enrolled for less than 3 years, n of schools involved = 1.

Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled for less than 3 years (+6.4%, n of schools involved = 2), but a decrease in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-12.9%, n of schools involved = 2).

- ***Experimental Schools*** - The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (+4.0%, n of schools involved = 2), and students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+2.5, n of schools involved = 2). However, the increase was much higher for the less than 3 years students.

Lightspan

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (+12.7%, n of schools involved = 1), and a decline in the student achievement of students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-23.7%, n of schools involved = 1).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (+8.7%, n of schools involved = 1), and a decline in the student achievement of students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-8.0%, n of schools involved = 1).

Microsociety

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-13.8%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-5.4%, n of schools involved = 1).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-25.2%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-20.1%, n of schools involved = 1).

Middle Start

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-20.1%, n of schools involved = 2) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-11.0%, n of schools involved = 2).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (-7.5%, n of schools involved = 2) than for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-3.4%, n of schools involved = 2).

School Development

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-10.3%, n of schools involved = 4) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-3.9%, n of schools involved = 4).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled for less than 3 years (+1.3%, n of schools involved = 5), and a decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-15.3%, n of schools involved = 5).

Talent Development

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-10.0%, n of schools involved = 2) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-1.4%, n of schools involved = 2).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a decline in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (-3.9%, n of schools involved = 1), and a positive growth in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+9.3%, n of schools involved = 1).

Core Knowledge

- ***Control Schools*** –The control school, Monnier, was dropped as a control school because it became a CSRD school in the second year of the study (2000-2001).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-28.4%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-5.8%, n of schools involved = 1).

See Tables 13 and 14.

MATHEMATICS

A comparison analysis was completed by CSRD grant funded model using the data of identified 3 years students and identified less than 3 year students who were at or above the 50th percentile on MAT7 in mathematics. The difference of the base year (1998-1999) and year 2 (2000-2001) were used to determine the achievement status for both the control schools and experimental schools by model. The results are as follows.

ATLAS Community

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-5.3%, n of schools involved = 5) than for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-0.5%, n of schools involved = 5).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (+1.5%, n of schools involved = 5), and students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+5.4%, n of schools involved = 3). However, the growth was much higher in the three consecutive years students.

Co-nect

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (+18.2%, n of schools involved = 1), and students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+8.0%, n of schools involved = 1). However, the increase was much higher for students enrolled less than 3 years.

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (-7.0%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-6.6%, n of schools involved = 1).

Different Ways of Knowing (DwoK)

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was the same positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years and students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+4.6%, n of schools involved = 2).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (+8.5%, n of schools involved = 2), and for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+4.1%, n of schools involved = 2). However, the growth was much higher for the less than 3 years students.

Lightspan

- ***Control Schools***– The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-8.6%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled less than 3 years (-3.5%, n of schools involved = 1).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled for less than 3 years (+14.6%, n of schools involved = 1) and for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+2.8%, n of schools involved = 1). However, the increase was much higher for the less than 3 years students.

Microsociety

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-13.8%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled less than 3 years (-3.1%, n of schools involved = 1).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-11.5%, n of schools involved = 1) than for students who were enrolled less than 3 years (-8.0%, n of schools involved = 1).

Middle Start

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a greater decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled for less than 3 years (5.4%, n of schools involved = 2) than for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-3.9%, n of schools involved = 2).

- ***Experimental Schools***– The MAT7 data indicates that there was a decline in student achievement for students enrolled for less than 3 years (-8.4%, n of schools involved = 2), and a positive growth in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+2.6%, n of schools involved = 2).

School Development

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that the achievement status stayed the same in 1998-1999 and 2000-2001 for students enrolled less than 3 years (0.0%, n of schools involved = 4), but there was a positive growth of +5.7%, n of schools involved = 4, for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years.

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (+1.6% n of schools involved = 5), and a decline in student achievement for students enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-1.4%, n of schools involved = 5).

Talent Development

- ***Control Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for both students enrolled for less than 3 years (+4.5%, n of schools involved = 2), and students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+4.0%, n of schools involved = 2). However, the increase was much higher for students enrolled less than 3 years.

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a decline in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (-2.3%, n of schools involved = 1), and a positive growth in students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (+0.2%, n of schools involved = 1).

Core Knowledge

- ***Control Schools*** - The control school, Monnier, was dropped as a control school because it became a CSRD school in the second year of the study (2000-2001).

- ***Experimental Schools*** – The MAT7 data indicates that there was a positive growth in student achievement for students enrolled less than 3 years (+1.7%, n of schools involved = 1), and a decline in student achievement for students who were enrolled in the same school for three consecutive years (-8.9%, n of schools involved = 1).

See Tables 15 and 16.

See **Appendix 1 - 4** for the total picture of the model results by individual control and experimental schools over a three-year period in both reading and mathematics.

Table 13
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student *Reading Less Than 3 Years* - Data Summary by Model
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

18 Control Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	3087	470	15.2	2697	396	14.7	2697	284	10.4	-4.7
Co-nect	1	233	33	14.2	255	40	15.7	288	71	24.7	+10.5
*DwoK	2	798	280	35.1	778	337	43.3	672	279	41.5	+6.4
Lighspan	1	427	112	26.2	366	109	29.8	368	143	38.9	+12.7
Microsociety	1	135	25	18.5	105	37	35.2	130	17	13.1	-5.4
Middle Start	3	573	127	22.2	576	70	12.2	534	60	11.2	-11.0
School Development	4	1810	425	28.4	1714	370	21.6	1686	386	22.5	-3.9
Talent Development	2	721	81	11.2	667	78	11.7	662	65	9.8	-1.4

19 Experimental Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	3090	450	14.6	3197	567	17.7	2941	314	10.7	-3.9
Co-nect	1	663	272	41.0	717	307	42.8	620	231	37.3	-3.7
*DwoK	2	1038	193	18.6	1012	206	20.4	908	205	22.6	+4.0
Lighspan	1	563	100	17.8	593	163	27.5	471	125	26.5	+8.7
Microsociety	1	271	103	38.0	240	56	23.3	263	47	17.9	-20.1
Middle Start	2	725	222	30.6	761	296	38.9	724	167	23.1	-7.5
School Development	5	2032	460	22.6	1907	455	23.9	1808	455	23.9	+1.3
Talent Development	1	391	81	13.0	349	80	22.9	350	32	9.1	-3.9
Core Knowledge	1	526	162	30.8	493	125	25.4	440	110	25.0	-5.8

77

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

78

The control school - Monview of Core Knowledge became a CSRD school.
Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for one year and who also took the MAT7 that same year.
*DwoK - Different Ways of Knowing

Table 14
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student *Reading* 3 Years - Data Summary by Model
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

18 Control Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	429	111	25.9	429	128	29.8	429	72	16.8	-9.1
Co-nect	1	162	25	15.4	162	34	21.0	162	25	15.4	0.0
*DwoK	3	502	241	48.0	502	238	47.4	502	176	35.1	-13.9
Lighspan	1	257	108	42.0	257	61	23.7	257	47	18.3	-23.7
Microsociety	1	58	21	36.2	58	29	50.0	58	13	22.4	-13.8
Middle Start	2	154	55	35.7	154	24	15.6	154	24	15.6	-20.1
School Development	4	624	205	42.5	624	192	30.8	624	201	32.2	-10.3
Talent Development	2	80	21	42.0	80	21	42.0	80	16	32.0	-10.0

17 Experimental Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	238	61	25.6	238	38	16.0	238	52	21.8	-3.8
Co-nect	1	255	75	29.4	255	81	31.8	255	88	34.5	+5.1
*Dwok	2	442	79	17.9	442	92	20.8	442	90	20.4	+2.5
Lighspan	1	176	51	32.4	176	51	32.4	176	43	24.4	-8.0
Microsociety	1	131	65	49.6	131	42	32.1	131	32	24.4	-25.1
Middle Start	2	236	89	37.7	236	77	32.6	236	81	34.3	-3.4
School Development	9	855	248	37.8	855	193	29.5	855	148	22.3	-15.3
Talent Development	1	88	8	9.3	88	12	14.0	88	16	18.8	+9.3
Core Knowledge	1	236	122	51.7	236	60	25.4	236	52	21.3	-30.4

'79

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

80

The control school - Member of Core Knowledge became a CSRD school.
Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.
*DwoK - Different Ways of Knowing

84

Table 15

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student *Mathematics Less Than 3 Years* - Data Summary by Model

1998-1999 to 2000-2001

18 Control Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	3887	545	17.7	2697	605	22.4	2697	463	17.2	-0.5
Co-op	1	233	24	10.3	255	43	16.9	288	82	28.5	+18.2
*DwoK	2	798	234	29.3	778	340	43.7	672	228	33.9	+4.6
Lighspan	1	427	217	50.8	366	159	43.4	368	174	47.3	-3.5
Microsociety	1	135	23	17.0	105	25	23.8	130	18	13.9	-3.1
Middle Start	2	573	90	15.7	576	57	9.9	534	55	10.3	-5.4
School Development	4	1810	318	19.6	1714	445	26.0	1698	427	25.3	+5.7
Talent Development	2	721	104	14.4	687	95	14.2	682	125	18.9	+4.5

19 Experimental Schools											
CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	5	3090	517	16.7	3197	615	19.2	2941	535	18.2	+1.5
Co-op	1	663	161	24.3	717	186	25.9	620	107	17.3	-7.0
*DwoK	3	1038	146	14.1	1012	200	19.8	908	205	22.6	+8.5
Lighspan	1	563	104	18.5	593	148	25.0	471	156	33.1	+14.6
Microsociety	1	271	60	22.1	240	34	14.2	263	37	14.1	-8.0
Middle Start	2	725	164	22.6	761	164	21.6	724	103	14.2	-8.4
School Development	5	2032	387	19.0	1907	485	25.4	1905	392	20.6	+1.6
Talent Development	1	391	34	8.7	349	37	10.6	350	31	8.9	+0.2
Core Knowledge	1	526	143	27.2	493	136	27.4	440	127	28.9	+1.7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The control school - Mannier of Core Knowledge became a CSRD school.

Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for one year and who also took the MAT7 for that same year.

*DwoK - Different Ways of Knowing

Table 16

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student *Mathematics 3 Year Results* - Data Summary by Model

1998-1999 to 2000-2001

18 Control Schools

CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	5	429	91	21.2	429	91	21.2	429	68	15.9	-5.3
Co-east	1	162	29	17.9	162	57	35.2	162	42	25.9	+8.0
*DwoK	2	502	153	30.5	502	172	34.3	502	176	35.1	+4.6
Lighspan	1	257	114	44.4	257	111	43.2	257	92	35.8	-8.6
Microsociety	1	58	18	31.0	58	25	43.1	58	10	17.2	-13.8
Middle Start	2	154	19	12.3	154	16	10.4	154	13	8.4	-3.9
School Development	4	624	218	34.8	624	488	30.1	624	218	34.8	0.0
Talent Development	2	50	18	36.0	50	23	46.0	50	20	40.0	+4.0

17 Experimental Schools

CSRD Model	# of Schools Involved	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
ATLAS											
Community	3	238	24	10.1	238	39	16.4	238	37	15.5	+5.4
Co-east	1	255	71	27.8	255	75	29.4	255	54	21.2	-6.6
*Dwok	2	442	69	15.6	442	85	19.2	442	87	19.7	+4.1
Lighspan	1	176	42	23.9	176	44	25.0	176	47	26.7	+2.8
Microsociety	1	131	36	27.5	131	25	19.1	131	21	16.0	-11.5
Middle Start	2	236	47	19.9	236	87	36.9	236	53	22.5	+2.6
School Development	6	655	190	29.0	655	193	29.5	655	181	27.6	-1.4
Talent Development	1	86	10	11.6	86	26	30.2	86	8	9.3	-2.3
Core Knowledge	1	238	79	33.5	238	76	32.2	238	58	24.6	-8.9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The control school - Monnier of Core Knowledge became a CSRD school.

Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

*DwoK - Different Ways of Knowing

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the district and schools review the findings presented in this report and use them to inform decision-making regarding project continuation.

2. In this preliminary report, it is important to emphasize that the MEAP data analysis targeted whole-school percentage counts at the satisfactory level only. The MAT7 data analysis reviewed whole-school percentage counts of students who scored at or above the 50^{th} percentile. In the next evaluation, it is recommended that statistical analysis be conducted of students scoring in the lower ranges.

3. Obtain staff stability records, if available, from the Detroit Public School System Human Resource Department to evaluate the staff stability at both the control and experimental schools over the years of the project. This is important for the assessment of the effects of staff stability on school success.

APPENDIXES

1-5

Appendix 1
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Reading Less Than 3 Years Results - Coded by Model
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

School Name		N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	Diff 1998-1999
	Code	Tested	50th	50th	Tested	50th	50th	Tested	50th	50th Percentile	to
Control		98-99	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile		2000-01
Chudacy	1	667	110	16.5	325	42	12.9	322	35	10.9	
Hardwoodtown	1	570	53	9.3	627	54	8.6	654	38	5.8	-3.5
Durfee	1	652	158	24.2	615	169	27.5	610	142	23.3	-0.9
Hampton Hill	1	515	110	21.4	412	91	22.1	384	41	10.7	-10.7
Kettering	1	683	39	5.7	718	40	5.6	727	28	3.9	-1.8
Subtotal		3087	470	15.2	2697	396	14.7	2697	284	10.5	-4.7
Kempton	2	233	33	14.2	255	40	15.7	288	71	24.7	+10.5
Subtotal		233	33	14.2	255	40	15.7	288	71	24.7	+10.6
Lottington	4	371	142	38.3	382	174	45.6	367	176	48.0	+9.7
Bagley	4	427	138	32.3	396	163	41.2	305	103	33.8	+1.5
Subtotal		798	280	35.1	778	337	43.3	672	279	41.5	+6.4
Van Zile	5	427	112	26.2	366	109	29.8	368	143	38.9	+12.7
Subtotal		427	112	26.2	366	109	29.8	368	143	38.9	+12.7
Lynch	6	135	25	18.5	105	37	35.2	130	17	13.1	-5.4
Subtotal		135	25	18.5	105	37	35.2	130	17	13.1	-5.4
Reddinton	7	427	120	28.1	454	57	12.6	422	46	10.9	-17.2
Krolik	7	146	7	4.8	122	13	10.7	112	14	12.5	+7.7
Subtotal		573	127	22.2	576	70	12.2	534	60	11.2	-11.0
Boynton	8	441	159	36.1	446	191	42.8	404	144	20.6	-15.3
Logan	8	344	93	27.0	370	70	18.9	361	104	28.8	+1.8
Post	8	502	91	18.1	568	47	8.3	628	48	7.6	-10.5
Greenfield Un	8	323	82	25.4	330	62	18.8	293	84	28.7	+3.3
Subtotal		1610	425	26.4	1714	370	21.6	1686	380	22.5	-3.9
Yost	9	122	42	34.4	91	29	31.9	78	18	23.1	-11.3
Flowry	9	599	39	6.5	576	49	8.5	584	47	8.0	+1.5
Subtotal		731	81	11.2	667	78	11.7	662	65	9.8	-1.4
Total	18	7584	1553	20.5	7158	1437	20.1	7037	1399	18.5	-2.0

School Name		N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	Diff 1998-1999
	Code	Tested	50th	50th	Tested	50th	50th	Tested	50th	50th Percentile	to
Experimental		98-99	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile		2000-01
Murray-Wright	1	787	118	15.0	772	189	24.5	728	90	12.4	-2.6
Lemmger	1	654	110	16.8	717	154	21.5	658	72	10.9	-5.9
Cody	1	721	144	20.0	835	120	14.4	767	69	9.0	-11.0
Cudley	1	432	52	12.0	385	67	17.4	325	40	12.3	+0.3
Southeastern	1	496	26	5.2	488	37	7.6	463	43	9.3	+4.1
Subtotal		3090	450	14.6	3197	567	17.7	2941	314	10.7	-3.9
Winterhalter	2	663	272	41.0	717	307	42.8	620	231	37.3	-3.7
Subtotal		663	272	41.0	717	307	42.8	620	231	37.3	-3.7
Mason	3	526	162	30.8	493	125	25.4	440	110	25.0	-5.8
Subtotal		526	162	30.8	493	125	25.4	440	110	25.0	-5.8
Hampton ES	4	440	89	20.2	453	95	21.0	403	71	17.6	-2.6
Clark	4	598	104	17.4	559	111	19.9	505	134	26.5	+9.1
Subtotal		1038	193	18.6	1012	206	20.4	908	205	23.6	+4.0
Parker	5	563	100	17.8	593	163	27.5	471	125	26.5	+8.7
Subtotal		563	100	17.8	593	163	27.5	471	125	26.5	+8.7
Hosmer	6	271	103	38.0	240	56	23.3	263	47	17.9	-20.1
Subtotal		271	103	38.0	240	56	23.3	263	47	17.9	-20.1
Munger	7	523	177	33.8	581	247	42.5	563	134	23.8	-10.0
Dst. Open	7	202	45	22.3	180	49	27.2	161	33	20.5	-1.8
Subtotal		725	222	30.6	761	296	38.9	724	167	23.1	-7.5
McMichael	8	347	32	9.2	332	36	10.8	315	53	16.8	+7.6
Cooke	8	336	138	41.1	297	110	37.0	270	126	46.7	+5.6
Bowdoin	8	670	98	14.6	650	97	14.9	627	92	14.7	+0.1
Cooper	8	437	87	19.9	393	144	36.6	482	122	25.3	+5.4
Greyling	8	242	105	43.4	235	68	28.9	211	62	29.4	-14.0
Subtotal		2032	468	23.6	1907	455	23.9	1905	435	23.9	+1.3
Phoenix	9	391	51	13.0	349	80	22.9	350	32	9.1	-3.9
Subtotal		391	51	13.0	349	80	22.9	350	32	9.1	-3.9
Total	19	9299	2013	21.6	9249	2255	24.3	8622	1686	19.6	-2.0

Code 1 = ATLAS Community CSRD Model
Code 2 = Co-nect CSRD Model
Code 3 = Core Knowledge CSRD Model
Code 4 = Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) CSRD Model
Code 5 = Lighspan CSRD Model
Code 6 = Microsociety CSRD Model
Code 7 = Middle Start CSRD Model
Code 8 = School Development CSRD Model
Code 9 = Talent Development CSRD Model

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Data reflect students who were enrolled in a school for one year and who also took the MAT7 for that same year.

Appendix 2
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Reading 3 Year Results - Coded by Model
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

School Name	Code	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
Control											
Chudacy	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	50.0	+50.0
Northwestern	1	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0.0
Darlas	1	295	96	32.5	295	115	39.0	295	59	20.0	-12.5
Hampton MS	1	70	10	14.3	70	9	12.9	70	8	11.4	-2.9
Kettering	1	59	5	8.5	59	4	6.8	59	4	6.8	-1.7
Subtotal		429	111	25.9	429	128	29.8	429	72	16.8	-9.1
Simpson	2	162	25	15.4	162	34	21.0	162	25	15.4	0.0
Subtotal		162	25	15.4	162	34	21.0	162	25	15.4	0.0
Lexington	4	257	117	45.5	257	108	42.0	257	101	39.3	-6.2
Bagley	4	245	124	50.6	245	130	53.1	245	75	30.6	-20.0
Subtotal		502	241	48.0	502	238	47.4	502	176	35.1	-13.9
Van Zile	5	257	108	42.0	257	61	23.7	257	47	18.3	-23.7
Subtotal		257	108	42.0	257	61	23.7	257	47	18.3	-23.7
Lynch	6	58	21	36.2	58	29	50.0	58	13	22.4	-13.8
Subtotal		58	21	36.2	58	29	50.0	58	13	22.4	-13.8
Middleton	7	101	53	52.5	101	18	17.8	101	18	17.8	-34.7
Lynch	7	53	2	3.8	53	6	11.3	53	6	11.3	+7.5
Subtotal		154	55	35.7	154	24	15.6	154	24	15.6	-20.1
Bryson	8	237	129	54.4	237	79	33.3	237	93	39.2	-15.2
Logan	8	171	72	42.7	171	57	33.3	171	58	33.9	-8.8
Post	8	87	13	14.9	87	15	17.2	87	18	20.7	+5.8
Greenfield Un	8	129	51	39.5	129	41	31.8	129	32	24.8	-14.7
Subtotal		624	265	42.5	624	192	30.9	624	201	32.2	-10.3
Yost	9	48	21	43.8	48	21	43.8	48	16	33.3	-10.5
Feeney	9	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal		50	21	42.0	50	21	42.0	50	16	32.0	-10.0
Total	18	2256	847	37.9	2236	727	32.5	2236	574	25.7	-12.2

School Name	Code	N Tested 98-99	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 99-00	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	N Tested 00-01	N At/Above 50th Percentile	% At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
Experimental											
Lemmger	1	148	43	29.1	148	23	15.5	148	31	21.0	-8.1
Colfax	1	89	18	20.2	89	15	16.9	89	21	23.6	+3.4
Northwestern	1	1	0	0.0	1	0	0	1	0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal		238	61	25.6	238	38	16	238	52	21.8	-3.8
Westerfield	2	255	75	29.4	255	81	31.8	255	88	34.5	+5.1
Subtotal		255	75	29.4	255	81	31.8	255	88	34.5	+5.1
Mann	3	236	122	51.7	236	60	25.4	236	55	23.3	-28.4
Subtotal		236	122	51.7	236	60	25.4	236	55	23.3	-28.4
Hampton ES	4	206	27	13.1	206	25	12.1	206	34	16.5	+3.4
Clark	4	236	52	22.0	236	67	28.4	236	56	23.7	+1.7
Subtotal		442	79	17.9	442	92	20.8	442	90	28.4	+2.5
Parker	5	176	51	29.0	176	51	29.0	176	43	24.4	-4.6
Subtotal		176	51	29.0	176	51	29.0	176	43	24.4	-4.6
Hoover	6	131	65	49.6	131	42	32.1	131	32	24.4	-25.2
Subtotal		131	65	49.6	131	43	32.1	131	32	24.4	-25.2
Munger	7	107	40	37.4	107	27	25.2	107	32	29.9	-7.5
Dist. Open	7	129	49	38.0	129	50	38.8	129	49	38.0	0.0
Subtotal		236	89	37.7	236	77	32.6	236	81	34.3	-3.4
McMillan	8	65	12	18.5	65	12	18.5	65	15	23.1	+4.6
Cooke	8	141	66	46.8	141	71	50.4	141	66	46.8	0.0
Bowdoin	8	144	31	21.5	144	31	21.5	144	23	16.0	-5.5
Cooper	8	188	81	43.1	188	52	27.7	188	31	16.5	-26.6
Grayling	8	117	56	47.9	117	27	23.1	117	11	9.4	-38.5
Subtotal		695	246	37.6	695	193	29.5	688	146	22.5	-15.3
Phoenix	9	86	8	9.3	86	12	14.0	86	16	18.6	+9.3
Subtotal		86	8	9.3	86	12	14.0	86	16	18.6	+9.3
Total	17	2455	796	32.4	2455	646	26.3	2455	603	24.6	-7.8

Code 1 = ATLAS Community CSRD Model
Code 2 = Co-nect CSRD Model
Code 3 = Core Knowledge CSRD Model
Code 4 = Different Ways of Knowing (Dwok) CSRD Model
Code 5 = Lighspan CSRD Model
Code 6 = Microsociety CSRD Model
Code 7 = Middle Start CSRD Model
Code 8 = School Development CSRD Model
Code 9 = Talent Development CSRD Model

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

Appendix 3

Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Mathematics Less Than 3 Years Results - Coded by Model

1998-1999 to 2000-2001

School Name		N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	Diff 1998-1999
	Code	Tested	Stds	Stds	Tested	Stds	Stds	Tested	Stds	Stds	to
Control		98-99	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile	Percentile	2000-01
Chaney	1	667	160	24.0	325	90	27.7	323	92	28.6	+4.6
Northwestern	1	579	59	8.8	627	134	21.4	654	113	17.3	+8.6
Durfee	1	632	186	29.5	615	129	20.8	610	123	20.2	-8.3
Hampton MS	1	511	90	17.5	612	200	48.5	384	59	15.4	-2.1
Kettering	1	683	59	8.8	718	53	7.4	727	76	10.5	+1.8
Subtotal		3697	946	17.7	3697	806	22.4	3697	463	17.2	-0.8
Empire	2	230	24	10.3	255	43	19.7	288	82	28.5	+18.2
Subtotal		230	24	10.3	255	43	16.7	288	80	28.5	+18.2
Lollingston	4	371	124	33.4	383	213	55.8	367	138	37.6	+4.0
Bagley	4	427	110	25.8	396	127	32.1	305	90	29.5	+3.7
Subtotal		798	234	29.3	779	340	43.7	672	228	33.9	+4.6
Van Zile	5	427	217	50.8	366	159	43.4	368	174	47.3	-3.5
Subtotal		427	217	50.8	366	159	43.4	368	174	47.3	-3.5
Lynch	6	135	23	17.0	105	25	23.8	130	18	13.9	-3.1
Subtotal		135	23	17.0	105	25	23.8	130	18	13.9	-3.1
Bethune	7	427	86	20.1	454	49	10.8	422	39	9.2	-10.9
Knolls	7	146	4	2.7	122	8	6.6	112	16	14.3	+11.6
Subtotal		573	90	15.7	576	57	9.9	534	55	10.3	-5.4
Boynton	8	441	76	17.2	446	162	36.3	404	123	30.9	+13.7
Logan	8	344	105	30.5	370	96	26.0	361	132	36.6	+6.1
Post	8	580	48	9.8	568	112	19.7	628	61	9.7	+0.1
Greenfield Lin	8	323	87	28.9	330	75	22.7	293	109	37.2	+10.3
Subtotal		1698	316	19.6	1714	445	26.0	1686	427	25.3	+5.7
Yost	9	122	40	32.8	91	25	27.5	78	12	15.4	-17.4
Posey	9	599	64	10.7	576	70	12.2	584	113	19.4	+8.7
Subtotal		721	104	14.4	667	95	14.2	662	125	18.9	+4.5
Total	19	7882	1933	24.5	7938	1769	24.9	7957	2372	29.8	+5.0

School Name		N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	N	N At/Above	% At/Above	Diff 1998-1999
	Code	Tested	Stds	Stds	Tested	Stds	Stds	Tested	Stds	Stds	to
Experimental		98-99	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile	Percentile	2000-01
Henry-Wil	1	787	179	22.7	772	188	24.4	728	183	25.1	+2.4
Lessinger	1	634	86	13.2	717	101	14.1	658	78	11.9	-1.3
Cody	1	721	161	22.3	835	189	22.6	767	163	21.1	-1.2
Colby	1	432	53	12.3	385	62	16.1	325	32	9.8	-2.5
Southeastern	1	496	38	7.7	488	75	15.4	463	80	17.3	+9.6
Subtotal		3090	517	16.7	3197	615	19.3	2941	536	18.2	+1.5
Westerlier	2	663	161	24.3	717	186	25.9	620	107	17.3	-7.0
Subtotal		663	161	24.3	717	186	25.9	620	107	17.3	-7.0
Mann	3	526	143	27.2	493	133	27.4	440	127	28.9	+1.7
Subtotal		526	143	27.2	493	133	27.4	440	127	28.9	+1.7
Hampton MS	4	640	43	9.8	453	64	14.1	403	60	14.9	+5.1
Clark	4	598	103	17.2	559	136	24.3	505	145	28.7	+11.5
Subtotal		1838	146	14.1	1012	200	19.8	908	205	22.6	+8.5
Parker	5	563	104	18.5	593	148	25.0	471	156	33.1	+14.6
Subtotal		563	104	18.5	593	148	25.0	471	156	33.1	+14.6
Pioneer	6	271	60	22.1	240	34	14.2	263	37	14.1	-8.0
Subtotal		271	60	22.1	240	34	14.2	263	37	14.1	-8.0
Krieger	7	523	126	24.1	581	101	17.4	563	69	12.3	-11.8
Dr. Open	7	202	36	18.8	180	63	35.0	161	34	21.1	+2.3
Subtotal		725	164	22.6	761	164	21.6	724	103	14.5	-8.4
Middleton	8	347	40	11.5	332	36	7.5	315	15	4.8	-6.7
Cesar	8	336	109	32.4	297	112	37.7	270	119	44.1	+11.7
Sheridan	8	670	105	15.7	650	171	26.3	627	118	18.8	+3.1
Cooper	8	437	78	17.9	372	110	29.0	382	82	17.0	-0.8
Grayling	8	242	55	22.7	315	68	28.9	211	58	27.5	+4.8
Subtotal		2032	387	19.0	1967	498	25.4	1905	392	20.6	+1.6
Pleasant	9	701	34	8.7	549	57	10.6	350	31	8.6	-0.1
Subtotal		701	34	8.7	549	57	10.6	350	31	8.6	-0.1
Total	19	9399	1716	18.8	9949	2084	21.6	8622	1691	19.8	+1.1

Code 1 = ATLAS Community CSRD Model

Code 2 = Co-nect CSRD Model

Code 3 = Core Knowledge CSRD Model

Code 4 = Different Ways of Knowing (Durell) CSRD Model

Code 5 = Lighthouse CSRD Model

Code 6 = Microsociety CSRD Model

Code 7 = Middle Start CSRD Model

Code 8 = School Development CSRD Model

Code 9 = Talbot Development CSRD Model

*Data reflect students who were enrolled in a school for one year and who also took the MAT7 that same year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 4
Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT7) Individual Student Mathematics 3 Year Results - Coded by Model
1998-1999 to 2000-2001

School Name	Code	98 Tested	98 At/Above 50th Percentile	98 % At/Above 50th Percentile	99 Tested	99 At/Above 50th Percentile	99 % At/Above 50th Percentile	00 Tested	00 At/Above 50th Percentile	00 % At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
Central		98-00	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile	Percentile	2000-01
Chudney	1	2	0	0.0	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0	+50.0
Northwestern	1	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0	0.0
Durfee	1	286	79	26.8	295	58	19.7	295	33	11.2	-15.6
Hampton Hill	1	70	8	11.4	70	24	34.3	70	24	34.3	+22.9
Kettering	1	59	4	6.8	59	8	13.6	59	10	17.0	+10.2
Subtotal		420	91	21.2	429	91	21.2	429	68	15.9	-8.3
Simpson	2	162	29	17.9	162	57	35.2	162	42	25.9	+8.0
Subtotal		162	29	17.9	162	57	35.2	162	42	25.9	+8.0
Lathington	4	257	72	28.0	257	88	34.2	257	108	42.0	+14.0
Bagley	4	245	81	33.1	245	84	34.3	245	68	27.8	-5.3
Subtotal		502	153	30.5	502	172	34.3	502	176	35.1	+4.6
Van Zile	5	257	114	44.4	257	111	43.2	257	92	35.8	-8.6
Subtotal		257	114	44.4	257	111	43.2	257	92	35.8	-8.6
Lynch	6	58	18	31.0	58	25	43.1	58	10	17.2	-13.8
Subtotal		58	18	31.0	58	25	43.1	58	10	17.2	-13.8
Tuckahoe	7	101	14	13.9	101	9	8.9	101	10	9.9	-8.0
Erwin	7	53	5	9.4	53	7	13.2	53	3	5.7	-3.7
Subtotal		154	19	12.3	154	16	10.4	154	13	8.4	-3.9
Guyasuta	8	237	86	36.3	237	69	29.1	237	80	33.8	-2.5
Logan	8	171	63	36.8	171	71	41.5	171	78	45.6	+8.8
Park	8	87	15	17.2	87	6	6.9	87	13	14.9	-2.3
Greenfield Un	8	129	52	40.3	129	47	36.4	129	45	34.9	-5.4
Subtotal		624	216	34.6	624	188	30.1	624	216	34.6	0.0
Yost	9	48	18	37.5	48	23	47.9	48	20	41.7	+4.2
Penny	9	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal		50	18	36.0	50	23	46.0	50	20	40.0	+4.0
Total	18	2256	650	28.4	2256	668	29.6	2256	637	28.5	-0.9

School Name	Code	98 Tested	98 At/Above 50th Percentile	98 % At/Above 50th Percentile	99 Tested	99 At/Above 50th Percentile	99 % At/Above 50th Percentile	00 Tested	00 At/Above 50th Percentile	00 % At/Above 50th Percentile	Diff 1998-1999 to 2000-01
Experimental		98-99	Percentile	Percentile	99-00	Percentile	Percentile	00-01	Percentile	Percentile	2000-01
Lemmger	1	148	17	11.5	148	22	14.9	148	23	15.5	+4.0
Colfry	1	89	7	7.9	89	17	19.1	89	14	15.7	+7.8
Southeastern	1	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal		238	24	10.1	238	39	16.4	238	37	15.5	+5.4
Westerfeller	2	255	71	27.8	255	75	29.4	255	54	21.2	-6.6
Subtotal		255	71	27.8	255	75	29.4	255	54	21.2	-6.6
Mazza	3	236	79	33.5	236	76	32.2	236	58	24.6	-8.9
S Jewett		236	79	33.5	236	76	32.2	236	58	24.6	-8.9
Hampton ES	4	206	16	7.8	206	17	8.3	206	19	9.2	+1.4
Clark	4	236	53	22.5	236	68	28.8	236	68	28.8	+6.3
Subtotal		442	69	15.6	442	85	19.3	442	87	19.7	+4.1
Parker	5	176	42	23.9	176	44	25.0	176	47	26.7	+2.8
Subtotal		176	43	23.9	176	44	25.0	176	47	26.7	+2.8
Hammer	6	131	36	27.5	131	25	19.1	131	21	16.0	-11.5
Subtotal		131	36	27.5	131	25	19.1	131	21	16.0	-11.5
Monger	7	107	11	10.3	107	28	25.5	107	11	10.3	0.0
Dor. Open	7	129	36	27.9	129	49	38.0	129	42	32.6	+14.7
Subtotal		236	47	19.9	236	87	36.9	236	63	22.5	+2.6
McMichael	8	65	15	23.1	65	7	10.8	65	2	3.1	-20.0
Crotts	8	141	37	26.2	141	64	45.4	141	75	53.2	+27.0
Brandeis	8	144	29	20.1	144	51	35.4	144	61	42.4	+22.3
Cooper	8	188	68	36.2	188	44	23.4	188	26	13.8	-22.4
Gaeyling	8	117	41	35.0	117	27	23.1	117	17	14.5	-20.5
Subtotal		655	190	29.0	656	193	29.5	656	181	27.6	-1.4
Pinnois	9	86	10	11.6	86	26	30.2	86	8	9.3	-2.3
Subtotal		86	10	11.6	86	26	30.2	86	8	9.3	-2.3
Total	17	3455	908	23.1	3455	630	26.5	3455	546	22.3	-8.9

Code 1 = ATLAS Community CSRD Model
Code 2 = Co-nect CSRD Model
Code 3 = Core Knowledge CSRD Model
Code 4 = Different Ways of Knowing (David) CSRD Model
Code 5 = Lighspan CSRD Model
Code 6 = Manzanedo CSRD Model
Code 7 = Middle Start CSRD Model
Code 8 = School Development CSRD Model
Code 9 = Talent Development CSRD Model

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Data reflect students who were enrolled in the same school for 3 consecutive years and who also took the MAT7 for the same 3 years.

Appendix 5

Detroit Public Schools

Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment

Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration

Survey of Providers

(1) Model: _____

(2) Service Provider's Name: _____

(3) **School:** _____

Thank you for participating in this survey. Its purpose is to gather information on Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Model provider services to the schools.

The information you provide is extremely valuable and will be useful in the continuation and expansion for future implementation of additional CSRD schools.

The telephone survey should take approximately five minutes to complete. We ask that you answer all of the questions to the best of your ability.

(4) What year was agreement reached that this model would be provided to this school?

☐ 1998-1999 ☐ 1999-2000 ☐ 2000-2001

(5) Do you know the exact date this model started in this school? _____

(6) What type of support service was provided to the school by the model provider? Indicate all that apply.

☐ On-site visits	☐ Professional development	☐ Newsletter
☐ Off-site visits	☐ School Improvement Monitoring	☐ Consultation
☐ Technology assistance		☐ Monitoring from the Model
☐ Teacher-training workshops	☐ Parent Involvement	☐ Other

(7) Were the teachers trained in the model? ..... ☐ Yes ☐ No

(8) If so, how many hours of training have been provided by model staff to this school? ..... _____

(9) What was the level of teacher readiness for the process?

☐ High ☐ Moderate ☐ Low

(10) Please rate the percentage of whole-school involvement in the model.

☐ 0-25% ☐ 25-50% ☐ 50-75% ☐ 75-100%

Appendix 5

Survey of Providers (Cont'd)

(11) How satisfied are you with the amount of contact between you, the model provider, and the school?

☐ Very satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Neutral/Not sure ☐ Dissatisfied ☐ Very dissatisfied

(12) Has the school followed through on the implementation process of the model? ..... ☐ Yes ☐ No

(13) If no, to your knowledge describe the problem. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(14) If yes, what are the major factors promoting implementation? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(15) How do you feel the school perceives the value of the services that you provided?.

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

(16) How do you feel the school perceives the quality of the services that you provided?

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Thank you for participating in this survey.